

# Christian Faith and Life

Combining The Bible Champion and The Essentialist

Volume 38

MAY, 1932

Number 5

## EDITORIAL

### A Remarkable Memorial

*To the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church*

A WIDE range of subjects are being brought to the attention of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of 1932, which is to meet in Atlantic City, during the month of May. Here are a few of the items already offered for the consideration of that body:

1. The church benevolent administration, including a recognition of the rights of churches to designate all their gifts.

2. The Episcopacy, including a desire to reduce it from life tenure to a term of years.

3. Peace, including a demand for the recognition of the rights of conscientious objectors, and a further curtailment of military training programmes.

4. The District Superintendency, including a request that the office be made elective, and that these officers be given a vote in the matter of transfers between annual conferences.

5. Salary items, including pensions for supplies, and that Bishops be returned at retirement to their respective annual conferences.

6. Church membership items, including the automatic transfer of persons moving from one community to another.

7. Advocates, requesting the continuance of several.

8. Faith, petitioning for a ringing declaration of the Church's loyalty to its established standards.

9. The ministerial office, including the idea of quadrennial instead of annual appointments.

10. Ethics, including a demand for the clarification of the church's position on divorce, and a petition for the establishment of uniform divorce laws in the Republic.

11. A request for the formation of a Central Conference in America for the Negro race.

12. A constitutional amendment seeking to abolish the Episcopacy as at present constituted, together with the authority of the Articles of Religion and of General Rules.

Of all these propositions, the last one is by far the most significant. It involves a radical change in the whole basis of the church, both in its faith and also in its ethical authority and government. In a word, the petitioners are seeking to remove the Methodist Episcopal Church from its historic foundations, and to set it adrift both in its government, its ethical basis, and its doctrinal foundation. If these petitioners gain the assent of the General Conference, Methodism will become a fluent thing, subject to extreme changes from quadrennium to quadrennium. For example, supposing the proposal be carried, the Episcopal Office might be stripped entirely of authority, and be reduced to an ornamental presidency limited to four years' duration by a simple majority vote of any General Conference. Or, the doctrinal position of Methodism might be changed from what it is to Unitarianism, Buddhism, or even humanism.

This memorial in question comes from the General Conference delegation of the Rock River Annual Conference. That representative group met at Evanston, Illinois, last



January. Their action was in four sections and covered five items.

First, it petitions the General Conference to amend the section of the constitution dealing with amendments by striking out the words which except Restrictive Rule one from its provisions. This change is necessary to prepare the way in advance for striking out this safeguard to the doctrinal foundations of the Church.

(2) It petitions the General Conference to provide for the striking out of Restrictive Rule one, which would empower the General Conference itself to change the doctrinal basis of Methodism.

(3) It requests the General Conference to change the doctrinal basis of Methodism, by removing the Articles of Religion from the constitution and placing them in the section of the discipline headed *Historical Statement*, where it will have nothing more than an antiquarian interest.

(4) It seeks to have the same two things done with the General Rules of the Church. The Fourth Restrictive Rule, which protects them, is to be abolished, and the spiritual standards of the Church are to be placed by the Articles of Religion as a mere unauthoritative, historical statement.

(5) It asks that the present episcopal form of government be abolished, and that the episcopacy be made the creature of the General Conference whims, just as it would have the Church's doctrinal position and its General Rules.

This is certainly a most remarkable document. We are printing it in full as it appeared under the date of February 25, in the *North Western Christian Advocate* (p.192).

#### FOR A SIMPLER CONSTITUTION

##### General Conference Memorial

At a meeting of the Rock River Conference delegation to General Conference, held January 11, in the First Methodist Church in Evanston, Ill., the following memorial was adopted by a unanimous vote:

"WHEREAS, Our present constitution was duly and legally adopted in the year 1900, and has been recognized and accepted as the fundamental law of the Methodist Church for the past thirty-two years; and

"WHEREAS, Article XI, which provides the method by which amendments to the constitution may be made, is as much a part of the constitution as any other part and may therefore be amended in the same manner; and

"WHEREAS, It is the theory of our republican form of government that all sovereignty rests in

the people, and they, therefore, have a right to determine for themselves how they wish to be governed; and

"WHEREAS, Our Articles of Religion and General Rules were written many years ago, and are not in harmony with modern thought and practice, and in any event have no rightful place in a constitution where only fundamental principles of government should be stated; and

"WHEREAS, The judiciary committee of the 1928 General Conference in its report 'No. 18,' rendered an opinion as to the effect that the power to limit the tenure of bishops could only be secured by an amendment to the constitution, and in its report 'No. 25,' that the right of the annual conferences to elect their district superintendents, could be secured in the same way, both of which decisions were approved by the General Conference; and

"WHEREAS, Constitutions are intended to set forth the broad fundamental principles for the government of an organization, leaving details to be written into the legislation where changes may be made more easily when required by changing conditions.

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, hereby memorialize the General Conference of 1932 to adopt the following constitutional amendments, and if they receive the required number of votes, in the General Conference, then we request that proper arrangements be made for a constitutional vote thereon by the several annual and Lay Electoral Conferences, in the year 1933."

#### Proposition I

Amend Article XI, paragraph 47 (Discipline, 1928), by striking out the words, "Excepting Article X. Section 1" in line 8. Said Article XI, paragraph 47, will then read as follows:

"The concurrent recommendation of two thirds of all the members of the several annual conferences present and voting, and of two thirds of all the members of the Lay Electoral Conferences present and voting, shall suffice to authorize the next ensuing General Conference by a two-thirds vote to alter or amend any of the provisions of this constitution; and also whenever such alteration or amendment shall have been first recommended by a General Conference by a two-thirds vote, then so soon as two thirds of all the members of the several annual conferences present and voting, and two thirds of all the members of the Lay Electoral Conferences present and voting, shall have concurred therein, such alteration or amendment shall take effect; and the result of the vote shall be announced by the general superintendents."

#### Proposition II

Strike out all of Section 1 of paragraph 46, Article X, which reads as follows:

"The General Conference shall not revoke, alter, nor change our Articles of Religion, nor establish any new standards or Rules of Doctrine contrary to our present existing and established standards of doctrine."

#### Proposition III

Amend Section 3 of paragraph 46, Article X, by striking out the words, "Nor destroy the plan of our itinerant general superintendency; but may elect a missionary bishop or superintendent for any



of our foreign missions, limiting his episcopal jurisdiction to the same respectively," and inserting therein after the word "episcopacy" in the third line, the following words: "but shall have full authority to elect as many general superintendents as it may deem wise, fix their tenure of office, and prescribe their powers and duties."

Said section as amended will then read as follows:

"The General Conference shall not change nor alter any part or rule of our government so as to do away episcopacy, but shall have full authority to elect as many general superintendents as it may deem wise, fix their tenure of office, and prescribe their powers and duties; and may empower Central Conferences to elect bishops or general superintendents whose episcopal supervision shall be within the territory included in the Central Conferences by which they have been elected, subject to such other conditions as the General Conference shall prescribe, provided, however, that a general superintendent or bishop elected by one Central Conference may exercise episcopal supervision in another Central Conference when so requested by such other Central Conference."

#### Proposition IV

Strike out the entire Section 4 of said paragraph 46, Article X, which reads as follows:

"Section 4. The General Conference shall not revoke or change the general rules of our church."

#### Proposition V

Remove from the constitution and place under the "historical statement" all of Divisions I and II, paragraphs 1 to 33. "Articles of Religion" and "General Rules."

This most significant memorial should command instantly the attention of the whole Church. Here at last the Modernistic drive in American Protestantism stands fully revealed. Methodism is to be unfounded and a great Church transformed into an indefinite association of benevolently-minded men. It is to have no established doctrinal basis, but is to be the sport of some current consensus of learned opinion. Similarly, it is to have no fixed standard of ethical requirements, but in the matter of ideals, as of faith, everything is to be fluent. It is to remain episcopal only in name, for, both in respect of its powers and of its duration, the episcopal office is made subordinate to the majority opinion of each successive General Conference. One is reminded of Edward Gibbon's striking sentence in connection with the first of the Caesars. He says:

Augustus was sensible that mankind is governed by names; nor was he deceived in his expectation that the senate and people would submit to slavery, provided they were respectfully assured they still enjoyed their ancient freedom (*Gibbon's Rome*, Vol. I, p. 122).

Doubtless it sounds like preserving Methodism's historic episcopacy to say "The Gen-

eral Conference shall not change nor alter any part or rule of our government so as to do away episcopacy," but when the paragraph goes on to empower the General Conference to "fix" the period of the Bishop's office, and to define his powers and duties, it is manifest that episcopacy has been done away in everything save the name. The fact is, this memorial would do away with Methodism, leaving of a great Church nothing either of its government, its ideals, or its faith; nothing in fact but its historical terminology now quite emptied of all significance.

An account of the rise of the Methodist Constitution will be helpful in any effort to understand this matter. When the Church was organized in America at the Christmas Conference of 1784, every preacher within the body was entitled to membership in the organizing group. As time went on and the number of preachers increased it was seen that this procedure was impractical. Consequently, in 1808 the principle of a delegated General Conference was instituted, and the powers of that delegated body were limited by the enactment of six Restrictive Rules.

To amend these Rules required the unanimous recommendation of the several Annual Conferences, and the subsequent two-thirds vote of the next ensuing General Conference. This method of amending the Restrictive Rules maintained the continued influence of the Annual Conferences as a whole, and preserved the General Conference in obedience to the general will of the Church.

As time went by it was felt that this method of amendment was too difficult. Consequently, in 1828, Wilbur Fisk proposed that the General Conference suggests to the Annual Conferences a simpler process of amending. After some modification his proposition was submitted to the several Annual Conferences where it was adopted and brought up by their unanimous approval to the General Conference of 1832. Here also it was adopted by unanimous vote. As modified the process of amending could originate either in the General Conference or the Annual Conferences. It required a two-thirds vote in the former body, and a three-fourths vote of all the preachers present and voting in the several Annual Conferences. It was, however, expressly provided that this new and modified method of carrying amendments did not apply to Restrictive Rule one,



which safeguards the Article of Religion.

No new provision for amending Restrictive Rule one was at that time indicated. Consequently, this rule, and the Articles protected under it, being excepted from the new provision, must have remained under the old. If this reasoning be correct, then the only procedure by which the First Restrictive Rule can be repealed and the Articles of Religion of the Methodist Church be modified, is the concurrent agreement of every Annual Conference in the denomination, and the subsequent vote of the next ensuing General Conference by a majority of two-thirds.

Wheeler, in his *Thousand Questions*, differs from this writer, claiming that the Articles can never be modified, but must continue the permanent basis of the Church (Wheeler, Question 483).

Bishop Neely, in his *Governing Conference of Methodism*, also differs from this writer, holding that the General Conference can start a movement to abolish the constitutionally provided exception, and that after this has been carried, it can subsequently start a movement to amend the First Restrictive Rule. But since the Constitution of the Church adopted in 1900 was not a new body of law, but instead an assembling of the several constitutional elements already in force during the century and a quarter of the Church's history, that total history must remain the interpretative basis of the present provisions, and the intention of the Church in 1808, and in 1828-32 must be considered in determining the force of the present excepting clause, which excludes Restrictive Rule one from being amended under its provisions.

Evidently the proposition of the Rock River delegation is unconstitutional, no matter how that document be interpreted. If Bishop Neely's opinions be accepted as authoritative, even then the excepting clause must be removed by the amending procedure before the General Conference has any right to essay to that which it is definitely prohibited from doing.

But quite apart from its constitutional unsoundness, this petition of the Rock River delegation evidently is a poorly thought out document. Clearly a church must have some fixed standard, both of faith and conduct. If in these important matters it is to be made the sport of the changing currents of world thought, it will inevitably lose its significance

and disintegrate.

The thing that needs to be borne in mind is, that in Christianity religion is witnessed to both by the soul of man and by a definite body of historical truth. This is the peculiar power of the Christian Gospel. The Christian Church is the vehicle and instrument of that historical witness, and must be maintained in obedience to that historical witness. If the Christian Church be divorced from its historical background and made a mere association of men dedicated to the realization of ideals, it would have ceased to be Christian, and would have lost the tremendous power and appeal which now comes to it from the circumstance of this double witness.

Let me say it again. The Christian Church belongs to the ages, and to no single age. When its great fundamental conceptions are too closely adjusted to any individual period in history, it is a misadjustment that is almost certain to bear disastrous fruit. The recent dispute over the Andover Foundation is an illustration in point. The doctrinal positions therein contained were too minute, and as a result became ineffective in the course of a century. What a Church needs is the general definition of its great headland position, and this is precisely what the Methodist Episcopal Church has in its Articles of Religion and General Rules. These standards have been repeatedly re-affirmed by each successive General Conference for the past three quadrenniums. They were reaffirmed in 1920, in 1924, and again and most emphatically in 1928.

The opening decades of the twentieth century have undeniably been a period of welter and confusion. The universities have been pouring into the ministry men whose faith has been educated away from the great historic truths of Christianity; but it would be preposterous to ask a Church to change its basis in order that it might conform to a mere current in university opinion that is already unfounded and passing away. The new developments in physics and astronomy have left the naturalism of the opening decades of the twentieth century wholly unfounded. We are at the threshold of a new epoch of supernaturalism and purposive thinking. When this has gained ascendancy in the intellectual world it will be found that the doctrinal and ethical standards of the Methodist Church are both sound and adequate.—H. P. S.



# The Biblical Story of the Quails

SINCE the old, old story of Moses and the quails was recently revived again, after it has long been laid in the grave, it may be worth while to explain it. We well remember that Mr. Ingersoll was wont to make merry over it. He represented the Bible as teaching that there was a vast number of quails, that they were piled so many feet on the ground, and that each Israelite must have eaten several thousands of them a day. Then he would remark facetiously: "I call those Israelites the champion quail eaters of the world!"

But Mr. Ingersoll was answered so often and so effectively that we thought the objection had been buried once and for all. But it seems not. The old infidel objections, no matter how often explained, are ever and anon resurrected by those who do not read the many explanations that have been given by Biblical scholars.

Among the many explanations of the story, that of H. L. Hastings, who wrote so many books and pamphlets in defense of the Bible, is one of the best. We believe it is worth copying, so that if any of our readers should be troubled by this infidel objection, they will know what the facts are. A valued friend in New York has furnished us the Hastings quotation. An infidel said to Mr. Hastings that the Bible could not be true because of the said quail story. When Mr. Hastings challenged the infidel to show him the place in the Bible where the story was told, he could not find it. But Mr. Hastings was able to find it at once. Then he says:

So I turned to the eleventh chapter of Numbers, and there read that, instead of the birds being piled up like cordwood on the ground three feet *deep*, the account says that the Lord brought the quails from the sea, and let them fall by the camp, as it were "two cubits *high*." That is, instead of flying overhead and out of reach, they were brought in about three feet high, where any one could take as many of them as he chose.

The Hebrew word *al*, rendered *upon* (Numbers 11:31), signifies *above* or *over*, as well as *upon*; and it is applied to the flight of birds: "fowl that may fly *above* the earth" (Gen.1:20); "a wind to pass *over* the earth" (Gen.8:1); "the curse that goeth forth *over* the face of the earth" (Zech.5:3); "darkness was *upon* the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God moved *upon* the face of the waters" (Gen.1:2). The Septuagint renders it *apo*, "*from* the earth;" and the Douai version gives the true sense thus: "They flew in the air two cubits *high* above the ground."

And this skeptical friend had gotten the birds packed solid three feet deep over a territory forty miles across! As if I should say that a flock of wild geese flew as high as a church spire, and some one should insist that they were packed solid from the ground up, a hundred feet high!

This quotation is taken from H. L. Hastings' lecture on *The Inspiration of the Bible*, Anti-Infidel Tract, N. 1. It may be profitable to look into the matter a little further. We give the translation of Numbers 11:31 according to the American Revised Version:

And there went forth a wind from Jehovah, and brought quails from the sea, and let them fall by (margin, over) the camp, about a day's journey on this side and a day's journey on the other side, round about the camp, and about two cubits above the face of the earth.

Thus we see that the revisers translated the preposition *al* by the word "above." Dummelow says, in his commentary: "The simplest interpretation of these words is that the quails were flying at this height (about 3 ft.) above the ground, which allowed the people to capture them easily. Quails usually fly low and with the wind." True; we have often seen our common American quails flying just that way.

But the absurdity of the infidel objection is seen when we note that the narrative does not say, or even intimate, that the Israelites ate *all* of the quails. They simply gathered and spread out as many as they wanted. Read the next two verses and see:

And the people rose up all that day, and all the night, and all the next day, and gathered the quails; he that gathered least gathered ten homers: and they spread them all abroad for themselves round about the camp. While the flesh was yet between their teeth, ere it was chewed, the anger of Jehovah was kindled against the people, and Jehovah smote the people with a very great plague. And the name of the place was called "The Graves of Lust," because there they buried the people that lusted.

Thus the Bible does not say that the people ate even all the quails that they had gathered. It is not at all probable that they did, because the very next verse (the 35th) says that they journeyed from that place to their next stopping place, which was Hazeroth; "and they abode at Hazeroth." It is difficult to see thus how the objectors could have ever gotten their strange conception. It is worthy of notice that Dr. Richard G. Moulton, in his *The Modern Reader's Bible*, gives this translation of the Bible account of the flight of the



quails: "about two cubits above the face of the earth." Luther also translates the phrase correctly: "zwo Ellen hoch ueber der Erde." We would also advise the reading of Gene Stratton-Porter's article in the *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. She shows that the incident described in the Bible is precisely in harmony with the natural history of the quails. It was the spring migrating season. The birds were coming up from central and southern Africa to seek their summer homes and breeding places in the north. She says:

The birds were in migration. The quail followed the Red Sea until they reached the point of the peninsula, where they selected the narrowest place, and when the wind was with them, they crossed the water. Not far from the shore arose the camp-fire of the Israelites. This bewildered them, and, weary from their journey, they began to settle in confused thousands over and around the camp. Then the Israelites arose, and, with the ever-ready

"throw sticks," killed a certain number for every soul of the camp, and spread the bodies on the sand to dry, just as Herodotus records (ii.77) that the Egyptians always had done (see Rawlinson, *Herod.*, II, for an illustration of catching and drying quail).

In his very interesting book, *From the Nile to Nebo*, Dr. F. E. Hoskins describes very graphically the flight and adventures of the quail as they migrate in the spring from central Africa northward. As they fly up lengthwise of the Red Sea, a strong wind often seizes them and carries them in vast numbers up the narrow defiles of the mountains on the eastern side. They fly low, and often become so weary that they settle on the ground. All these natural history facts give to the experiences of the children of Israel an air of reality, and they also agree with the facts as scientific research discovers them.—L. S. K.

## Comments on Topics of the Times

PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, M.A., D.D.

### Some Really Narrow Views

Christianity is a system of truth of vast magnitude. It accepts the doctrine of an infinite God; it also believes that this universe is of vast dimensions, but is under omnipotent and omniscient control. But what are some really narrow doctrines? Well, materialism is one of them. It can see matter and mechanism only. It cannot glimpse anything more than mere material substance. Is that a broad doctrine? It can see in man nothing but corporeity—just a mass of bones, muscles, nerves, etc.—that is all. It cannot see that he has a mind, which is an entity of a far higher and nobler order than mere flesh and bones. That man has been made a little lower than the angels is too high and noble a doctrine for the materialist. The doctrine that this little earthly life is all there is for man, according to Russell and Wells, is also a narrow view. A doctrine which irradiates the present life and promises an eternal destiny is surely much greater and infinitely more engaging; and that is just what Christianity teaches.

### Something Good on the Pentateuch

A series of articles in several successive numbers of *The Evangelical Quarterly*, London, England, carry the title, "The Higher

Criticism of the Pentateuch Re-examined." They are written by Rev. A. L. Lumb, D.D., who reasons well. We want to capture some of his cogent statements:

If the Pentateuch is made up, as the critics maintain, by various editors working over sources of different dates, and of incorporating bits of one and then another into the whole, is it quite reasonable to expect that such a wonderful unity would be the outcome as is to be seen in the Old Testament? Of course, some may say that the unity is only there because the books are arranged in a certain order. If they are put in a different order, the unity at once disappears. [To this the author replies] . . . if by one plan we get a definite purpose, and by another no such unity can be gotten, then, since God is not the God of confusion but of order, it is most reasonable to say that the arrangement of the books which gives the picture unity is most probably the one God intended when He inspired men to write down His words.

### Our Lord's Treatment of the Old Testament

The author above cited quotes a paragraph from Dr. G. Campbell Morgan that is pertinent to his contention and that we believe will interest our readers:

From Christ's first recorded word, through all His subsequent doing and teaching, it is evident that He recognized the divine authority of the Mosaic economy. . . . Out of the thirty-nine books He quoted in the course of His ministry twenty-four in words actually recorded for us. Approximately there are to be found sixty-six quotations from, or allusions to, the Pentateuch, forty from



Isaiah, thirty-six from the Psalms, and twenty-two from Daniel—yes, positively from Daniel! There is no escape from the conviction that Jesus treated the Old Testament as divine, and therefore authoritative.

### Taking Him at His Word

Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick has again given us a surprise. We hardly know what to think of it, but, just as we accept the Bible at its face value, so we will accept some of his recent statements at their face value, without questioning his motives and without resorting to satire. In a recent sermon, as reported in the *New York Times*, he said:

At this point Modernism fails. It has breadth and easy-going complacency, and general goodwill, but lacks moral grip to lift men above the ordinary levels of daily life, and give them courage, if necessary, to defy trial. . . . In comparison with the hard-headed candor and fearlessness with which the old theology faced the terrific facts of the world, our Modernism often seems soft and lush and sentimental. We fair-weather Modernists, with our too easy gospel of God as a sentimental lover, would better salute those old Christians.

### Scientific Men see Design

It is gratifying to note how many eminent scientific men today see intentionality in the realm of nature and the world of mankind. Sir Oliver Lodge puts it in a very emphatic way when he says: "The universe is shoutingly full of design, plan, intention, purpose, reason." We cite the testimony of Sir James Jeans: "We discover that the universe shows signs of a designing or controlling power that has something in common with our own individual minds." The only trouble with some of these scientists is, while they frankly admit the evidence of design and even of mind in the universe, they do not pass on courageously to the logical conclusion, and assert that there must be a personal God who created and who sustains the universe and who has a wise and beneficent purpose in it all. But perhaps no man can find that truth by mere human genius and research, and for that reason we need the Bible to reveal the true nature of God to us.

### Something about Uni-celled Creatures

Our friends of the evolutionary school tell us that the first forms of life were the amoeba, or one-celled creatures, and that from them all the more complex and advanced living forms were developed. They overlook an important fact that completely demolishes

their theory. There are many kinds of uni-celled creatures that could not possibly have existed prior to the higher orders of creatures. On this point we quote from Dr. W. Bell Dawson's tract, entitled *Is Evolution True?* Speaking of these simple, one-celled creatures, he says:

First of all, is it certain that these are the primary living things and the earliest in the world? In reality there are very large groups of one-celled creatures which can live only with the help of what is more advanced than themselves. Some are helpful to plants and live on their roots (enabling plants to assimilate nitrogens). Then the moulds and other scavengers live on decaying matter. Many others live within the bodies of insects and animals; and some kinds get their nourishment from these animals, while others help them to digest their food. Others again cause diseases. It is plain that none of these kinds could have existed before there were well-developed plants and higher animals in the world.

Again we must say to the evolutionists, *Verbum sat sapienti!*

### Disease Germs do not Change

Here is some evidence that simple-celled creatures remain the same through all their generations, and the reason is given why it must be so. The quotation is also from Dr. Dawson, who writes:

Among them all (that is, the simple-celled creatures), the disease germs have probably been the most carefully studied. Yet, if there were any change at all, this study would be quite useless; because from one year to another, a typhoid germ might turn into a malarial germ. There would thus be no certain way of telling one disease from another. One year for these germs is the same as 175 centuries in producing breeds of cattle. So it is really very wonderful that they show no change whatever. How can the evolutionist explain this?

### The Difference between Plants and Animals

Our author, Dr. Dawson, depicts the essential difference between plants and animals, showing clearly that it was and always will be impossible for the former to develop into the latter. Let us take careful heed to what he says:

We may sum it all up by saying that plants make food, and animals use it up. This is strictly correct; and the use to which the animals put this food is just the opposite of what the plant has done. We could make this very plain if we could go into the chemistry of it all; but we will give only one sentence of this: Plants produce starches and albumins directly from inorganic substances by de-oxidizing them; whereas animals consume them by oxidizing them, and thus obtain their heat and muscular energy. This shows the gap which there is between vegetable and animal life, which on the whole are just the opposite of each other.



## The Babylonian Legend of Creation

An informing series of articles on the above subject has been running for several months in *The Bible Witness*, Runnimeade, Middlesex, England, written by the well-known archaeologist, Dr. Theophilus G. Pinches. After giving a translation of the legend, Dr. Pinches adds these reflections:

Such is, in outline, the Babylonian account of the creation; and it is easy to see that it differs widely from the Biblical account in Genesis. The Hebrew account is strictly monotheistic, whilst the Babylonian legend of this great event is polytheistic. There is no reference to the days of creation with an orderly account of the work of each day. There are other wide differences, such as the absence of any real description of the creation of the heavens and the earth; the absence of the deity as the first and only cause of the existence of things; the evolutionary nature of the Babylonian account; and the very evident fact that it presents an utterly different point of view.

## The Doings of the Gods

The following description of the doings of the Babylonian gods will prove how utterly improbable it would have been for the writer of Genesis to go to the pagan myth for any of his material. We quote again from Dr. Pinches as given in the February issue of *The Bible Witness*:

The gods afterward sat down to a feast, in which some kind of nectar (Langdon translates "beer") was drunk, and they were entertained with music. Stations were then fixed for the gods of heaven and earth; the fifty great gods took their seats; and the seven gods of fate fixed the fates (for all men). These were the gods of the sun, the moon and the five planets. The gods also showed their gratitude to the weapons which Merodach had used by giving them names and assigning to them places among the stars and constellations of the sky.

## A Low View of Human Beings

A reviewer of Clarence Darrow's autobiography tells us about this unbeliever's ideas of human life and human beings. What is his appraisal? Darrow's belief is "that nothing very much matters, because human beings are merely so many insects clinging to a mud ball which is one of the minor phenomena of the universe." This is the language of the reviewer of Mr. Darrow's book. To us it is amazing that intellectual men are so much impressed with mere material bulk; that it counts more in their estimation than mind, personality and self-consciousness. Why, not one of the great stars

is conscious of its own existence, nor are all of the vast orbs of the universe put together conscious of themselves. But man, although small as to his physical make-up, is a self-conscious and sentient personality, capable of thinking, reasoning, aspiring, feeling, volition, ethical and spiritual experience and culture. What a contrast between the Biblical estimate of man and that of the skeptics and cynics! "Thou hast made him (man) a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor" (Ps.8:5).

## The Highest Kind of Being

We maintain that the highest kind of existence of which we can conceive and remain on empirical ground, is self-conscious personality, with ethical and spiritual qualities. Apropos to these thoughts, we find something good in one of our exchanges, quoted from a writer in a recent number of the *Hibbert Journal*:

By self-consciousness I include those intellectual, moral and spiritual qualities which come from reason, judgment and anticipations of the future. So far as we can see, this consciousness is *sui generis*, and is not natural or characteristic activity of life or matter, since both of these can exist and act without it. Consciousness has thus its own phenomena and laws, which can be determined only by a study of human experience, and not by objective experimentation on animals, plants or matter alone.

We would like to call the attention of Darrow, Barnes, Watson, and others of their ilk to these statements from a writer in a great and scholarly British journal.

## Soul the Greatest Thing

A recent writer attributes a noble sentiment to Horace Bushnell. If the writer does not give Bushnell's precise language, he gives his idea correctly. It is this: "The soul of all improvement is the improvement of the soul." Is not that a good epigram? It is worth lodging in the memory of every person, and especially of the young people of this generation. We wish it could be injected deep into the consciousness of modern would-be philosophers who can see only physical substance in the universe and who, therefore, deny the existence of the soul. What a cure such an adage, if thoroughly believed, would effect on the sad and dismal "modern temper" of Joseph Wood Krutch and others! The only rescue from the bogs of despair is the belief that men have souls and that God has revealed a way by which they may be renewed, cleansed and improved.



### The Pekin Ape-Man

The latest news we have of the Pekin Ape-Man (so-called) comes to us through a British magazine. Dr. O. Sdansky, a young Austrian explorer, found the remains of over a dozen specimens of this race. When first discovered, they were hailed as the long-sought missing link between man and his supposed animal ancestors. But more lately Professor Breuil, of the Sorbonne University, has made a further examination of the fossils and the excavations, and found evidences that the said race constantly lighted fires, constructed stone tools, carved the horns of animals in the best manner, and used skulls and bones of stags as vessels. Says our informant regarding this Pekin man: "Although his facial type differs widely from our own, he was undoubtedly a man and not an intermediate form."

### More of "The Modern Temper"

A previous number of this magazine gave a somewhat extended review and critique of

Joseph Wood Krutch's book, *The Modern Temper*. His view is that science has proved that life is futile and that the outlook is extremely dismal; that man has been disillusioned regarding all his fondest hopes and highest aspirations. Even moral distinctions are an illusion; so is the existence of the soul as an entity; the same is to be said of the belief in immortality. Well, another writer has tried to characterize the present age. It is Galsworthy, the well-known novelist. In one of his stories, *The Modern Comedy*, he depicts our age "as an age that knows not what it wants, yet is intensely pre-occupied in getting it." Of course, that is a kind of Irish pun, but it may be true of many people of our day, especially those who have fallen into doubt. However, we would suggest to these sad and somber philosophers that the acceptance of the Christ of the Bible and the Christian system of truth and salvation, and an experience of their verity, would banish all their gloom, and cast a clear light upon their pathway.

## Christian Evidence

BISHOP H. M. DuBOSE, D.D., LL.D.

## Christianity and Galley Slavery

NEXT to the Spanish Inquisition, the system of galley slavery, existing practically through three centuries, up to less than a hundred years ago, and chargeable, for the most part, to the French nation, is the greatest reproach of Christendom throughout its history. It is amazing that Christianity, which destroyed and made hateful the gladiatorial shows, with their often holocausts of early Christian believers, could have compounded with the Inquisition, or consented to the horrors of galley slavery. But the institution of both is referable to a degraded and besotted age whose religion is scarcely worthy of being called Christian; and it is of record that when Christianity recovered itself, through that mighty movement known as the Reformation, these horrors not only ceased; but their return forever was made impossible. This record is a testi-

mony that bears directly on that faith whose appeal is made to the written Word. The inquisition and galley slavery did not come, as some might say, in spite of Christianity, but in default of Christianity, that is to say, during a hiatus in its spiritual life. The church of the dark ages was an abdication of the true spirit of Christianity.

Galley slavery, as an institution, or custom, developed through a nautical situation, which obtained, especially in the Mediterranean, during the whole of the middle ages, and later. The nations bordering on that sea had inherited the galley ship from the ancient Greeks and Romans. The galley (Greek, *galea*; Latin, *galerus*, a helmet) was a single decked sea craft, standing high above the waterline, and propelled, at first, by oars; later, by both oars and sails. The regulation galley of this type consisted generally of



thirty banks of oars, with two oars to the bank. Six to seven men were required to operate each oar, which was of great sweep and deep blade, so as to make an effective fulcrum of the water. Often a galley carried a manifest of 1,200 to 1,500 men. Ships of this character were used in naval warfare, as well as for commerce. The last naval battle of importance fought with galley ships was that of the Gulf of Lepanto, in 1571, in which Don Juan, commander of the allied fleets of Spain, Venice and the Papal States defeated the Turkish navy, and thus started the decline of the Ottoman power in Europe.

Galley slavery, as such, began in France in 1532. Previous to that time, the galleys were rowed by free seamen, captives or mariners of impressment. As early as 1561, an enactment in France doomed all prisoners of given grades of offense to the galleys. It was then that the floating hells of the Mediterranean came into the picture. Prisoners sent to the galleys were generally sentenced for life. They were chained to the oar seats, and there were kept, except for the brief hours allotted them for sleep; and then they were herded together like cattle, without couches or the simplest tokens of comfort. Their food was a miserable pretext; and they constantly died from malnutrition, infectious and intestinal diseases. Each prisoner was branded on his forehead, or elsewhere on his body, with the letters "G-a-l," signifying the name for his floating prison house.

In literature are found many descriptions of the wretchedness of galley slaves, as also of the rigors and inhumanity of their punishment. Jean Marteilles, who wrote the diary of a Huguenot, or Protestant, who suffered as a galley slave, is referred to as an authority on the excesses and atrocities of the galley slave system. But of all who have dealt with the subject none is so well known as Victor Hugo, in his story of *Les Misérables*. At a vantage, he gives us a description of a company of convicts, going from Paris to their places in the galley ships at Marseilles. I have thought well to give here a copious extract from that description as a basis for our study:

All sorts of distress met in this procession as in chaos; here were to be found the facial angles of every sort of beast, old men, youths, bald heads, grey beards, cynical monstrosities, sour resignation, savage grins, senseless attitudes, snouts surmounted by caps, heads like those of young girls with cork screw curls on the temples, infantile visages, and by reason of that, horrible thin skeleton faces to

which death alone was lacking. On the first cart was a negro, who had been a slave in all probability, and who could make a comparison of his chains. The frightful leveler from below, shame, had passed over these brows; at that degree of abasement, the last transformations were suffered by all in their extremest depths, and ignorance converted into dullness was the equal of intelligence converted into despair. There was no choice possible between these men, who appeared to the eye as the flower of the mud. It was evident that the person who had the ordering of that unclean procession had not classified them. These beings had been fettered and coupled pell-mell, in alphabetical disorder probably, and loaded haphazard on these carts. Nevertheless, horrors, when grouped together, always end by evolving a result; all additions of wretched men give a sum total: each chain exhaled a common soul, and each dray load had its own physiognomy. By the side of the one, where they were singing, there was one where they were howling; a third where they were begging; one could be seen in which they were gnashing their teeth; another load menaced the spectators, another blasphemed God; the last was as silent as the tomb. Dante would have thought that he beheld his seven circles of hell on the march; the march of the damned to their tortures, performed in sinister wise, not on the formidable and flaming chariot of the Apocalypse, but what was more mournful than that, on the gibbet cart.

One of the guards, who had a hook on the end of his cudgel, made a pretense from time to time of stirring up this mass of human filth. An old woman in the crowd pointed them out to her little boy five years old, and said to him, "Rascal, let that be a warning to you."

As the songs and blasphemies increased, the man who appeared to be the captain of the escort cracked his whip, and at that signal a fearful dull and blind flogging, which produced the sound of hail, fell upon the seven dray loads: many roared and foamed at the mouth; which redoubled the delight of the street urchins who had hastened up, a swarm of flies on these wounds. . . . At that moment the cudgeling, multiplied by a hundred hands, became zealous, blows with the flat of the sword were mingled with it, it was a perfect storm of whips and clubs; the convicts bent before it, a hideous obedience was evoked by the torture, and all held their peace, darting glances like chained wolves. . . . It was the chain gang, in fact, which had set out before day break from Bioêtre, and had taken the road to Mans in order to avoid Fontainebleau, where the king then was. This caused the horrible journey to last three or four days longer; but torture may surely be prolonged with the object of sparing the royal personage the sight of it.

Charles IX forbade a galley sentence to run beyond ten years. That was some mitigation in theory; but, in fact, there were few that survived long enough to benefit by the royal clemency. A few years generally ended the life of each "miserable;" and then his corpse was cast into the sea to be devoured by sharks. However, long before the relief of death had come, the memory of him had been lost to the world and to those who had



loved him, or cared, if any such there were. Also the story of the cruelties he had suffered—the bloody scourgings with weighted thongs; the chill of the midnight storm; the stench of diseased and vermin infected bodies about him; the gnawings of hunger; the savage inhumanity without, the hell within—there was no record of these. The horrors of the Inquisition were open to the eyes of a gloating public and to the constituents of an adulterous ecclesiasticism; but the horrors of the galley ship were known only to the angels and to—God.

Slowly the heaven of Christianity, renewed, wrought in the brutal soul of humanity. In 1748, France abolished the galley system of punishment, and remanded the galley prisoners to certain ports of the country; but even there the old galley hulls were used as prison houses, and much of the rigorous rote of the old servitude was exacted. Toulon, Rochefort and Brest became the centers at which the former sea-faring slaves were gathered. Greater skill in the adaptation of sail rigging, and the use of gunpowder in naval warfare had put the galley ship out of date both for commercial and naval ends; but so long as the rotting keels and boards were left, they echoed to the dying shame of a system that cursed humanity and shamed the name of Christianity.

The French Legislative Assembly, in 1791-2, greatly mitigated the punishment of such criminals as were classed under the head of galley slaves; but it was not until 1832, only one hundred years ago, that the system was abolished; nor was it wholly discontinued at Toulon until 1870. Victor Hugo, who has given us so vivid a picture of the galley slavery of an earlier century, therefore had opportunity to witness for himself the scenes which he has depicted; and it is not unlikely that in his more youthful days, about 1820 to 1830, there should have occurred a departure of convicts from Paris to Toulon in close resemblance to those which so often befell in the earlier centuries. Prison reform was at that time a living issue both in France and England. The works of Jeremy Bentham, the great English jurist advocate of prison reform, were then being read in both countries, and the world's prince of novelists was preparing to thunder in his masterpiece, *Les Misérables*. Justice and humanity were beginning to walk hand in hand. Through manifold channels, requickenened Christianity was at work.

But as it took primitive Christianity nearly three centuries to combat and efface the barbarism of the old gladiatorial shows, so it took reformed Christianity nearly an equally long time to completely blot out the curse of galley slavery and its contingencies in the penal laws of Europe. Nothing more certainly stigmatizes the morality and theology of mediaeval ecclesiasticism than its tolerance of galley slavery; while nothing more certainly glorifies the new spirit of Christianity than the thoroughness with which it has dealt with the inhumanity of former penal laws in all lands. This new spirit is an abiding testimony to the truth of the old evangel. Renewed Christianity is now grappling with such remaining evils as organized avarice, the drug habit, drunkenness and license. The living word is its pledge of victory.

Nashville Tennessee

## A Day of Intercession

ON Tuesday, April 5, the Moody Bible Institute of Chicago held a day of prayer for the nation in its present spiritual need. Invitations were sent to some three hundred ministers and laymen of Chicago and its environs to join with the faculty, students, business staff and employees in supplication and intercession. Classes were canceled and the business offices partially closed, while meetings were held almost continuously for twelve hours with much power and blessing. Dr. Gray, President of the Institute, in his public invitation declared that "the nation's trouble comes from neglect of and rebellion against Jehovah and against His Anointed, and nothing but repentance and confession of sin can avert His heavier hand upon us." —William M. Runyan.

Keeping in the middle of the road we avoid the ditches on either side. If, instead of disputing over what they believe, people would spend their time in inquiring what God has said, they would find less to dispute about, and more to agree upon, and would be greatly profited and instructed. Men argue long to prove that the Scripture favors or opposes something which is not mentioned in the Bible at all. Why not drop unscriptural phrases and statements, and take the Scripture itself and believe it?—*Hastings Birthday Book*, p. 168.



# Current Scientific Discoveries

PROFESSOR GEORGE MCCREADY PRICE, M.A.

## “The Decline of Determinism”

A NOTABLE address with the title given above was delivered in London, England, on January 4, 1932. The address was by Sir Arthur Eddington, whose name is known wherever scientifically educated people are found around the world. While not the first intimation of the tremendous change which has come over the scientific thought of the world, this address is so clearly and pointedly expressed, and withal is so eminently readable, though coming from one of the most noted of world-specialists, that I cannot do better than to give a portion of it here for the readers of CHRISTIAN FAITH.

My quotations and references will all be from the “Supplement” to *Nature*, February 13, 1932, pp. 233 to 240. And everyone who is competent to judge knows that *Nature* is about the most high class scientific journal in the entire world.

Eddington’s first sentence tells the whole story: “Determinism has faded out of theoretical physics.” The doctrine of a rigid determinism, or scientific fatalism, has dominated physical science for more than two hundred years, a fatalistic scheme which ruled the omnipotent God entirely out of His universe, and gave everything over to hard, iron laws, awful with inevitable fates.

“Ten years ago,” says Eddington, “practically every physicist of repute was, or believed himself to be, a determinist, at any rate so far as inorganic phenomena are concerned.” Today, he picks up one of the latest treatises on advanced mathematical physics and says that he cannot find this subject of determinism or causal law referred to in any way—the subject is simply ignored, for science has learned to get along without it. But he explains:

The rejection of determinism is in no sense an abdication of scientific method; indeed it has increased the power and precision of the mathematical analysis of observed phenomena.

Eddington dextrously shifts the burden of proof, and shows that the modern physicist

no longer holds the position of chief advocate of determinism. In surprised wonder he declares that he is “unaware of any deterministic law in the universe;” and he calls for some one else—philosophers, psychologists, theologians—“to come forward and show, if they can, that they have found indications of determinism in some other way.”

It is a safe guess to say that such a challenge will never be accepted. For determinism originated with theoretical physics; now when this fails it, the doctrine of determinism must hide its abashed head forevermore.

Parts of Eddington’s paper are somewhat technical, in spite of the real genius shown by its author for simplification and vivid illustration. He is quite inimitable in his ability to make a complicated and abstruse subject clear and vivid before the minds of his hearers or readers. But it is not my purpose to give a formal summary of this paper. I would be rash indeed to attempt to give any adequate statement of the subject in less space than he has devoted to it. But it is important for intelligent Christians to have a clear grasp of the general fact that modern physical science no longer stands as the supporter of a deterministic scheme of the universe. And when mathematical physics no longer supports this idea, it will be difficult for the materialists and the mechanists to find any other science to which they can appeal in support of their favorite dogma. In biology, as everybody knows, mechanism has always had a hard time, a very hard time. It has never been able to put up a good defense—and it has always been on the defensive in biology, never on the aggressive—and now with its main support gone, it is clear that its days as a reasonable scheme are numbered. It will, of course, survive in such journals as are pledged to the fight against Christianity; for such publications are always indifferent to the real facts; all they appear to be after is to be able to keep up a line of attack against the Christian religion,



even though their arguments are generations out of date. And they would not be running true to form unless they still kept up their accustomed arguments based on the now exploded dogma of determinism.

Eddington explains that indeterminism is not by any means confined to the behavior of the radioactive atom; for it is a general principle "which applies in greater or lesser degree to all kinds of phenomena." And when the advocate of determinism, in his usual fashion, tries to place the burden of disproving his dogma upon the scientist, Eddington very properly shows that the burden of proof is the other way around. Determinism is a mere dogma, and should be positively supported; why should those who disbelieve it be asked to disprove it?

It must be realized that determinism is a positive assertion about the behavior of the universe. It is not sufficient for the determinist to claim that there is no fatal objection to his assertion; he must produce some reason for making it. I do not say he must prove it, for in science we are ready to believe things on evidence falling short of strict proof. If no reason for asserting it can be given, it collapses as an idle speculation.

It is astonishing that even scientific writers on determinism advocate it without thinking it necessary to say anything in its favor, merely pointing out that the new physical theories do not actually disprove determinism. If that really represents the status of determinism, no respectable scientific journal would waste space over it. Conjectures put forward on slender evidence are the curse of science; a conjecture for which there is no evidence at all is an outrage. So far as the physical universe is concerned, determinism appears to explain nothing; for in the modern books which go farthest into the theory of the phenomena no use is made of it.

Indeterminism is not a positive assertion. I am an indeterminist in the same way that I am an anti-moon-is-made-of-green-cheese-ist. That does not mean that I especially identify myself with the doctrine that the moon is *not* made of green cheese. Whether or not the green-cheese lunar theory can be reconciled with modern astronomy is scarcely worth inquiring; the main point is that green-cheesism, like determinism, is a conjecture that we have no reason for entertaining. Unprovable hypotheses of that kind can be invented *ad lib*.

What is the meaning of all these new discoveries in terms of human life? The answer is not obscure. As Eddington expresses it: "If the atom has indeterminacy, surely the human mind will have an equal indeterminacy; for we can scarcely accept a theory which makes out the mind to be more mechanistic than the atom." These discoveries make "it possible that the mind is not utterly deceived as to the mode in which its decisions are reached." We all have a vivid conscious-

ness of real freedom in making our choices; and if we cannot trust this feeling of human freedom, what trust can we place on the other conclusions of the human mind? This is Eddington's argument. Says he: "If it is true that the mind is so utterly deceived in the story it weaves round our human actions, I do not see where we are to obtain our confidence in the story it tells of the physical universe."

Natural science has always boasted of its objectivity. It claimed to deal only with absolute "facts" obtained from the external world. But all our most thoughtful scientists are now realizing that all scientific "facts" contain theories, that even mathematical physics, supposedly the most objective and the most rigidly demonstrable of all the sciences, is built upon highly debateable postulates and hypotheses. Never by purely scientific methods alone can we ever get at the real heart of nature, nor can we ever hope to reach the real origin of anything in a materialistic sense. Sooner or later, as we penetrate deeper and deeper into phenomena, we find ourselves getting in behind any conceivable materialistic cause; so that unless we are frankly willing to face the First Cause, we must withdraw from our search baffled and humiliated by our utter inability to "explain" any scientific phenomenon whatever. To appropriate the words of P. W. Bridgman of Harvard, one of our most thoughtful scientists, "As we penetrate ever deeper, the very law of cause and effect, which we had thought to be a formula to which we could force God himself to subscribe, ceases to have meaning."

The present slump in the reputation of determinism and materialism will be of vast service to our modern world, if we can only learn the great lesson that God not only created the universe in the beginning, but that He is still actively engaged in conducting all the affairs of His universe. He is not an absentee God, nor has he delegated his powers or his authority to the "forces" or the "laws" of nature. And blessed is that student of the works of God's who can find in the natural world the key with which to unlock the deeper lessons of religion.

*Berrien Springs, Michigan*

O brother man, fold to thy heart thy brother;  
Where pity dwells, the peace of God is there;  
To worship rightly is to love each other,  
Each smile a hymn, each kindly deed a prayer.

—Whittier



# The Church in Europe

FREDERICK HASSKARL, M.A., B.D.

## The Word of the Living God

RECENTLY a little bit of ecclesiastical advertising came to my attention which read about as follows, "Your minister has set the goal for 100 new members by Easter. He is determined to have 100 people stand before the altar by that time. Will you be one? Will you help to add to the growing fame of ——— Church?" And thus it continued. I ask, why just a hundred? Is it because it is a "round" number?

It is the old story of counting heads for the preacher's sake and sinfully neglecting the weightier things of the Law, namely, the evaluating of individual souls for Christ's sake. St. Paul said, "Not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called." Nevertheless, what was the secret of St. Paul's apostolic success? Why are his thirteen Epistles the norm and standard—along with the other New Testament writings—of genuine Christianity? To my mind it is because he could say, "Necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the *Gospel*."

This thought was constantly with me as I read and then translated the article of Dr. Doehring on "The Word of the Living God." Without further comment I submit his sententious conclusion for earnest meditation.

"He, who is attentive to the soul of our people, is strongly conscious of an alarming unrest. There is a deep-seated reason that in our days all things economical and political are devoid of comfort and joy. If man's word could create order of the chaos,—for enough and sagacious words have been spoken,—should we not be able to notice something of it? With the many official and parliamentary addresses and with the still larger flood of magazine articles and newspaper write-ups, with which the public has been overfed to a state of nausea,—surely something should be produced which could awaken a sense of joyfulness and of comfort!

The opposite is the case. There is a pent-up nervousness on all sides, a boiling point of deep passion is rising to the degree that one really has but to expect the day when the explosion results.

"Accordingly, the fact can no longer be denied: man's words have reached the end of their art. But back of this fact is the fateful question, whether we must in reality begin somewhere else, or whether it is still the proper thing to try to cure the sore spot on the skin by salve instead of asking about the ultimate cause by treating the blood. The helplessness of the method up-to-date is proved beyond the shadow of a doubt. Why do we not dare to make the jump from man's word to God's Word? It seems to me the reason that hinders one from resolving to do so is to be found in the fact, that one does not actually have trust in the creative power of God's Word. And this fact is explained by saying that for many generations one has accustomed oneself to conceive of all life's happenings only from the human but not from the divine side. The helplessness, which is so noticeable in its crippling effects the world over, signifies nothing more than the tragic conclusion of another epoch of mankind, in which mortals began to pay homage to the madness that they themselves were gods and needed no longer the living God.

"So there arose a satiated generation. In all nations there sprang up a humanity which had no understanding for last and deep questions. If one really did feel the seriousness of things one was satisfied with philosophical question-asking. As though this ever had been able to give creative impulses to life! If it was able to accomplish much it was generally this: Their disciples were permitted to hear the rushing of the living stream of God's Spirit, but they were utterly incapable to place them into this living stream's healing waters. *So also today we see the philosophers making great gestures. However, gestures are mere vaporous deeds. The world*



*needs actual ones.* Only when God's Word becomes mighty in man's word is it possible for the same to work healingly and savingly. For the sore spot of this troubled world of humanity lies in the fact, that man is seeking health of the spirit and salvation of soul where it cannot be found, namely in politics and economics. One recommendation follows the other; one theory falls before the other. And the philosophers keep on guessing and producing riddles!

"What had to come of this endless harangue naturally came: now no one wants to hear anything at all. One has become deaf simply because too much has not only been spoken, but above all things too much has been promised. With every new promise the already wearied expectation was whipped once again into attention. Just once more glowing eyes looked for that which was to come. And it never came. That is to say, the same always came: the nerve consuming, soul killing *nothing*. But to be sure one thing remained: the deep hunger for life."

Here Dr. Doehring delves into German Church History. He recalls the fact, that the Germanic peoples had been given such a marvelous taste of God's Word through the great Reformation, that there is still a longing, passed on from generation to generation, for solid food. Indeed, he maintains this desire is so deep that it cannot be banished. But at the same time he is fully conscious of the fact, that Germany is now paying high tribute because of its satiety during the last generation. The significance of the Reformation and its re-discoveries in the Word of God have lost much in its midst.

"However," Dr. Doehring continues, "a notable change is taking place. A great awakening is evident. A healthy hunger is manifesting itself. On the one hand one has become hard-hearing regarding the hopes of politics and economics; on the other hand one has become so keen in hearing when the deepest tones are struck, those deepest of tones, which await the echo from the innermost of man.

"The experience of the prophet is being repeated in our own days, 'Thy words were found, and I did eat them.' Naturally this significant change is distastefully unpleasant to those who have been working for decades to spoil the soul-hunger of our people for the Word of God. For they now feel themselves trapped on their by-ways of deceit. They are noticing here and there their

mask has been torn away: the so called friends of the people are now known to be the seducers of the people. They thought themselves able to falsify the oldest of life's law, 'Man liveth not by bread alone, but by every word, that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.' And it is especially noteworthy to observe, that the working classes of our people are gradually recognizing, that a highly dubious service has been rendered them, when one began to drive them to the limit and demanded that they neglect their inner life. They were promised freedom and they were led into bondage. They were torn from their bread-givers, only to be muzzled by their drivers.

"He who knows the Word of God, knows self-evidently this: *It speaks to the soul and to the conscience of both employer and employe. It spares neither the high nor the low. It is able and ready to give unto both what it is superlatively and supremely capable of giving: joy and solace for the heart. That is to say, the marvelous power of willing, born of the Will of God, to be able to say 'yes' to His Will. This is the essence of it all: God's creative deeds take place in the world of men always when man is willing to hear whenever God speaks.* The productive brain activities do not save a people, but the productive functions of the soul do. *And they are Faith, Hope, Love.* Wherever they enter life there is joy and solace in the heart and with them the power of initiative and confidence.

"To say it all in a word: *hunger for life is hunger for God.* When a soul has discovered that it has discovered its eternal purpose. The third petition of the Lord's Prayer becomes increasingly fulfilled, 'Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.' Faith becomes mighty, love is active, and hope lightens the way."

Dr. Doehring closes with an ardent appeal, really almost a prayer, as follows:

"Ye, my German people, ye have no other choice: Man's word or God's Word. The last word of man is death. God's last Word is Resurrection! Oh, that ye may experience the Miracle of God's Word anew!"

This should be the burning appeal, yea, prayer, for all peoples the world over. For "Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation. Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. Search ye the Scriptures."

Wilmington, Delaware



## THE PULPIT

JAMES M. GRAY, D.D.

FLOYD TOMKINS, D.D., LL.D.

CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY, D.D.

I. M. HARGETT, D.D.

MILTON HAROLD NICHOLS, D.D.

REV. CARLTON R. VANHOOK

ELMER ELLSWORTH HELMS, D.D. WALTER D. BUCHANAN, D.D., LL.D.

THOMAS S. BROCK, S.T.D.

### I am Not Alone

HAROLD PAUL SLOAN, D.D., LL.D.

*I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me.—John 8:16.*

WERE you ever far from home, alone, perhaps alone in a great city or out on the edge of some wilderness, alone and tempted? And did you say, "No one knows me; no one sees me; no one thinks about me. I can do whatever I please, for no one will know, and no one will be able to tell?" Did you ever have this experience?

Perhaps you answer, "Yes," and then add, "I remember those lonely moments with a sense of shrinking fear,—and yet as a matter of fact my habits did hold me, and I did not do wrong." No, you did not do wrong, but have you ever stopped to realize that your point of view itself was wrong? No Christian man whose experience is vital can feel himself thus alone. To live in the isolation of self with no sense of a tenanted Divine Presence within is itself sin.

Jesus says in the text, "I am not alone, but I and my Father,"—and this point of view is the very genius of His moral perfections. The fundamental law of His life is that He was and chose to be uninterruptedly conscious of His Father's presence. Every motive of His life was enriched by this sense of inner relationship.

The Scriptures are full of this truth. One finds it constantly both in John's Gospel and in the Synoptics. Let me set down a few of the greater passages that you can feel for yourselves the weight and power of this consciousness.

I do nothing of myself, but as my Father has taught me (John 8:28).

My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me (John 4:34).

My doctrine is not mine, but His that sent me (John 7:16).

I am not come of myself, but He that sent me is true (John 7:28).

I know Him, for I am from Him, and He has sent me (John 7:29).

My Father worketh hitherto, and I work (John 5:17)

The Son can do nothing of himself but what he seeth the Father do (John 5:19).

I can of mine ownself do nothing (John 5:30).

I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which has sent me (John 5:30).

As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father (John 10:15).

No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son (Mat. 11:27)

Father, the hour is come; glorify thou thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee (John 17:1).

That they may be one, as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee; that they may also be one in us (John 17:21).

Jesus had a profound sense of His relation to His Father; and his sense of an indwelling presence was at once the spring and glory of His life. Without His sense of this indwelling presence His moral exaltation would have been impossible. As He said, the natural man, who is without a sense of this inner presence, must be born again before he can so much as appreciate the values which make up the Kingdom of God.

"I am not alone"—This experience and law of Jesus' life must be also the law of the believer's life. As Jesus' inner consciousness was ever enriched by a sense of the presence of His Father so the believer's inner consciousness constantly must be enriched by a sense of the presence and intimacy of his Saviour. This is the significance of that tremendous sentence Jesus addresses to His disciples on the night before His Cross. "It is expedient for you that I go away," He said, "for if I go not away the Comforter will not come; but if I go away I will send Him unto you" (John 16:7).

There may be times when the law of truth does not hold. There doubtless are times when the law of kindness does not hold. There are even times when the sixth commandment—Thou shalt not kill—loses its authority. We fully recognize that there are circumstances under which we should let men suffer or even cause them pain for their own larger good. We also recognize that he



who takes a life in defense of an innocent life is guiltless. These things are clearly recognized, and will not be challenged. The principles of truth and kindness do not always hold, but the principle enunciated by Jesus in the text holds at all times and under every circumstance. There could never have been a time or a circumstance under which the Son of God could have acted from His own desire alone, apart from the will of His Father; and similarly there can be no time or circumstance when the believer can rightly act from his own desire alone apart from the conscious presence of his Lord. Our Lord Himself points out this parallel between His own relation to the Father and ours to Him in many passages. One of the most striking is that preserved in his notable discourse in the Capernaum synagogue, when He was bringing to a climax His Galilean ministry. He said:

As the living Father has sent me, and I live because of the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live because of me (John 6:57).

Again He says:

I am the door; by me if any man will enter in, he shall be saved (John 10:9).

Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself except it abide in the vine, nor more can ye (John 15:4).

In the record by the Synoptists, Jesus says:

Whosoever, therefore, shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father, which is in heaven (Matt. 10:32).

Our Lord then goes on to detail the supremacy and significance of our relation to Him. He insists that it must be more sacred than our love of father or mother, yes even than our love of life itself. He concludes with a tremendous declaration that the most insignificant act, even to the giving of a cup of cold water to a child in the name of a disciple, because it touches His life, has everlasting significance. This truth of a life divinely tenanted and energized lies behind the invitation in Matthew 11:28, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." Speaking also of this experience of the divinely tenanted life through the Holy Spirit, Jesus says:

In that day ye shall know this: I in my Father, ye in me and I in you.

If a man love me, he will keep my words, and my Father will love him (John 14:20-23).

#### AN ANALYSIS OF THIS EXPERIENCE

In a considerable degree we can analyze and comprehend the significance of this

whole experience of the Christ tenanted soul. Men are free, creative, personal beings through the experience of self-consciousness; but this experience of self-consciousness is lonely, desolate. It stands a man apart from everything else around him. It isolates him. Because his soul is capable of infinite outgoings, this sense of isolation and loneliness inevitably fills him with the longing of unsatisfied desire. The infinitude of a man's desirings and the lonely isolation of his self-consciousness make him grasping, jealous, proud. They drive him into every excess of vice. The life thus driven by its sense of self and desire quite inevitably will sin. Man's lonely sense of self is an inorganic motive. It makes him self-exalted or proud, self-sufficient or independent, self-willed or willful, self-seeking or greedy, self-occupied or egoistical, self-exaggerated or egotistical.

The inner sense of Christ on the contrary produces opposite results. It makes life in its deepest consciousness a joyous fellowship, rather than a lonely sense of me. This Christian experience of divine fellowship produces a new point of view toward all of life, a new appreciation of all values. It is a self-consciousness as distinct from a me-consciousness, and it is organic. Instead of driving us into the excesses familiar to us as greed, jealousy, pride, self-seeking, it produces such noble bearings as humility, love, brotherliness, obedience.

We can hear this experience expressed in the great hymns of the church. They are rich with an immediate inward sense of the reality of Christ which issues in an outgoing of life in joyous loving brotherhood. "Jesus is real to me," runs the gospel chorus; and St. Bernard has uttered the same in more stately lines, saying,

Jesus, thou joy of loving hearts,  
Thou light of life, thou light of men,  
From the best bliss that earth imparts  
We turn unfilled to thee again.

In these hymns Jesus is more than an idea, He is a presence, and the sense of His presence produces a fellowship. It issues in a life of brotherhood and obedience, a life of joyous humble unity. Let the hymn writers express this fruitage of the Christ tenanted heart:

O Master, let me walk with thee,  
In lowly paths of service free,  
Tell me thy secret, help me bear  
The strain of toil, the fret of care.

Or again:



Lord speak to me that I may speak  
 In living echoes of thy tones,  
 As thou hast sought, so let me seek  
 Thy erring children, lost and lone.

Or once again:

Saviour, thy dying love, thou gavest me,  
 Nor should I aught withhold, dear Lord, from  
 thee,  
 In love my soul would bow, my heart fulfill its  
 vow,  
 Some offering bring thee now, something for  
 thee.

Give me a faithful heart, likeness to thee,  
 That each departing day henceforth may see  
 Some work of love begun, some deed of kindness  
 done,  
 Some wanderer sought and won; something for  
 thee.

#### HERE IS THE TRIUMPH OF THE CHRISTIAN AGES

It was this inner sense of Christ, and this outflowing of that inner sense in joyous love and obedience that explains the devotion of the martyr church. Christ was not to them an idea or a mere historic fact. He was a divine person, Who indwelt their very being; and to keep their testimony to His isolate grandeur unconfused, they gladly offered Him the tribute even of their martyrdom. Had they been willing to sacrifice their testimony to His isolate divinity by offering incense at the altar of Caesar, they could have lived on in the Empire without fear or loss. But the glory of their divine inner Christ was too precious a reality either to be sacrificed or compromised. They refused the incense to Caesar, and poured out upon the altar of their divine Lord joyously and without stint their very life-blood.

It was this inner sense of Christ also that energized the Church in the days of its conquering evangelism. Can you recollect the lives they lived in those other days, and testimony they gave? They kept Sunday as a day apart. They cooked their food on Saturday and ate it cold upon the Lord's Day. They brushed their shoes, they washed, they shaved on Saturday. On Sunday they did none of these things. It was God's Day, on it they reverently walked, they did not run. They guarded their conversation. If they read it was religious literature or the Bible. They gave the whole Sunday to worship that Christ might be glorified.

They went further. In all of life they refused every excitement, counting all as sin. Whether it was cards or dancing, the circus, the pool table, bowling, the theatre, boxing,

horse-racing, they cast out all. They refused every adornment of dress, whether of gold or ribbons or flowers. Their churches were unornamented and severe. They looked with suspicion upon paintings, sculpture, music.

These are the things we remember about them, but these things were not the center of their passion. They were desperately in earnest. To them Christ was real, sin was real, salvation was real. Regeneration was an experience that manifested itself in a transformed life, and they expected it to be thus manifest. When people broke away from these noble values and became neglectful, they were expelled from the church.

Heaven was indeed real to these men and women of yesterday. They felt that they were verily upon the way to that blest abode. Hell, too, was real. They believed that sin brought men an awful damnation. An old aunt of one of the members of this church, who belonged to those yesterdays of Christian thought, lay dying. She called her relatives about her, and said: "I am about to die, I am going to God; and you will have to change your ways if we are ever to meet again."

It was all desperately real and powerfully earnest, that religion of yesterday. Doubtless even the careless thinker will see the danger of Pharisaism in such a readiness to judge as that manifest at the death bed of the aged aunt. Doubtless, too, we will be forced to admit the artificiality of some of their ideals and the superficiality of some of their distinctions.

In spite of any criticism that can be brought against the church of yesterday, it is true that it did have a powerful sense of the inner Christ, and that it did with passionate eagerness mediate Him to men and women, and pass Him on un-reduced to the generations beyond.

This is the supreme value which I am anxious you should see. The rules and customs with which they surrounded their inner experience of Christ, and by which they sought to make it effectively known were incidental. Such rules and customs must change from generation to generation, but the reality of their experience of the indwelling Christ is the changeless reality. It was magnificent, and it was the very soul of their religion and of all effective Christianity.

This is the point at which we are failing. Our scholarship has obscured the Christ of



history, and our religious compromises have dimmed the transforming power of the inner Christ of experience. The church of today scarcely feels any responsibility to witness to His saving power. In part I fear that some of us may have lost the sense of His inward presence. Some may never even have experienced it. We have religious education with its habit formation, and its social service discussions. We have interracial brotherhood, world peace, and economic democracy; but these are all speculative and remote.

The powerful inward thing that our fathers had, we do not have. They had the inner experience of Christ and a burning passion to make Him known; and this is what we need. Our lack of this inner experience is slowly undermining all our ideals. There is an increasing looseness among us in the matter of sex relations. The young womanhood of our churches is widely cheapening itself with the coarse habit of cigarette smoking. They seem to be unconscious of the fact that it is an easy step from coarseness to compromised virtue. Sometimes we even think that moderate drinking is smart. We do not mind slight departures from honesty and truth; for to be too passionately honest is apt to appear as prudishness.

How blind we have become! Have we forgotten so soon the deprivation and fear of the drunkard's home? Have we never touched those lives, who, beginning with compromised honor have found themselves at last ruined victims of their own increasing sins? How many times have men and women who have thus made wreck of their own honor described to me the hell of their experience, and said with pathos in their voices and tears in their eyes, "I have lived in hell these years past!" Must these experiences come home to us in our own lives before we can realize the devastating consequence of compromised virtue and sacrificed honor?

We have had many shocks these last years, but they seem not to have shocked us. It appears almost as if we had lost our power of moral resentment. But I do not want to condemn; nor do I want to invent rules for men's lives. We are the sons of God, free within our relationship to Christ. If, however, we are truly Christian, if we are really in relationship to Christ, then at the center of our souls is the dominating experience, "I am not alone." Are we in this sense Christian? Does Christ indwell us? Has the Holy

Spirit revealed Him in our hearts? Are we walking daily in His presence and fellowship? Is He ordering all our living? Do our lives move in and through Him? These are the supreme questions; and if the answer in our hearts is not a ringing, certain, joyous "Yes," then there is reason for repentance.

If He is not real to me, if I am not measuring my conduct against the whiteness of his sinless life, and pressing after Him, then I have faltered or fallen, and I must repent, or I will lose Him forever.

Our learning has taught us to laugh at hell, but hell is nevertheless a fact. It has taught us to mock at the idea of lost souls, but notwithstanding our mocking, lost souls are true. Right now as they mock those very mockers are themselves gliding peacefully into that tragic ruin. Sin is a dreadful thing, but sin is not any particular false act. It is just living alone; living a little self-driven life; living bereft of the exaltation of the inward companionship of Christ.

I have not seen *Green Pastures*—I rather question that I would care to see it. I think many of its passages would offend my sense of reverence for holy things, but a friend described to me its powerful closing scene. One who represents the angel Gabriel stands looking out a window down upon Calvary. They are crucifying Jesus. The successive events of that awful Good Friday are related one by one. Then the eternal God says: "This is the last thing I can do to save men; if this should fail, there is nothing more that I can do."

What a thought that is! God has gone to His uttermost extreme; beyond the cross of Christ there is nothing more. If we go by the cross nothing is left but ruin. Sin damns; and sin is not playing cards. Sin is not smoking cigarettes. Sin is not gambling. Sin is not drinking. Sin is not adultery or murder. Sin is living any kind of a life away from and apart from the inner revelation of that God who came to us in Jesus Christ.

"I am not alone," said Jesus, and to be thus inly companioned is salvation. To be alone is sin. My brethren, the church of this modern world needs to do a great deal of repenting, but, alas, we are ashamed to repent. How many of us seem less ashamed of our sins than we do of repenting for them. Oh, the tragedy of a sin perverted mind!



We need to repent because we have let men go on in sin, and have not warned them.

We need to repent because we have felt so little responsibility to make the witness of Jesus Christ effective in our generation.

We need to repent because we have been so careless about our own fellowship with Christ.

We need to repent because of the coarse violations of the sanctities of our own souls.

We need to repent because we have grieved those who have loved us.

We need to repent because of our smart independence, and our heedless willfulness.

The church of the twentieth century needs to repent, to turn to Christ in repentance. We need to do this from our clergy through

to our children. We have turned aside. We must turn back, in godly sorrow, repentant, believing as at the beginning. It is the hour of opportunity. It is a moment of a great new Christian advance. If we will heed His call to repentance, if we will cut our shore line and move out by faith into the open sea of His grace, the Holy Spirit will reveal Him within our hearts, will exalt us in His fellowship, and our transformed lives and churches will radiate the glory of His power unto the creation of a new age.

The secret of it all is the God tenanted heart, the Christ tenanted heart. In vivid experience to feel and know the truth of Jesus' words, "I am not alone," this is the pressing need of our times.

## Current Religious Thought

### The Higher Criticism

CANON DYSON HAGUE, M.A., D.D.\*

#### Chapter I

*What is the meaning of the Higher Criticism? Why is it called higher? Higher than what?*

AT the outset it must be explained that the word "Higher" is an academic term, used in this connection in a purely special or technical sense. It is not used in the popular sense of the word at all, and may convey a wrong impression to the ordinary man. Nor is it meant to convey the idea of superiority. It is simply a term of contrast. It is used in contrast to the phrase, "Lower Criticism."

One of the most important branches of theology is called the science of Biblical criticism, which has for its object the study of the history and contents, and origins and purposes, of the various books of the Bible. In the early stages of the science Biblical criticism was devoted to two great branches, the Lower, and the Higher. The Lower Criticism was employed to designate the study of the text of the Scripture, and included the investigation of the manuscripts, and the dif-

ferent readings in the various versions and codices and manuscripts in order that we may be sure we have the original words as they were written by the Divinely inspired writers (See Briggs, Hex., p.1). The term generally used now-a-days is Textual Criticism. If the phrase were used in the twentieth century sense, Beza, Erasmus, Bengel, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Scrivener, Westcott, and Hort would be called Lower Critics. But the term is not now-a-days used as a rule. The Higher Criticism, on the contrary, was employed to designate the study of the historic origins, the dates, and authorship of the various books of the Bible, and that great branch of study which in the technical language of modern theology is known as Introduction. It is a very valuable branch of Biblical science, and is of the highest importance as an auxiliary in the interpretation of the Word of God. By its researches floods of light may be thrown on the Scriptures.

The term Higher Criticism, then, means nothing more than the study of the literary structure of the various books of the Bible, and more especially of the Old Testament. Now this in itself is most laudable. It is

\*Rector of the Memorial Church, London, Ontario. Lecturer in liturgics and ecclesiology, Wycliffe College, Toronto, Canada. Examining chaplain to the bishop of Huron.



indispensable. It is just such work as every minister or Sunday school teacher does when he takes up his Peloubet's Notes, or his Stalker's St. Paul, or Geikie's Hours with the Bible, to find out all he can with regard to the portion of the Bible he is studying; the author, the date, the circumstances, and purpose of its writing.

#### WHY IS HIGHER CRITICISM IDENTIFIED WITH UNBELIEF?

*How is it, then, that the Higher Criticism has become identified in the popular mind with attacks upon the Bible and the supernatural character of the Holy Scriptures?*

The reason is this. No study perhaps requires so devout a spirit and so exalted a faith in the supernatural as the pursuit of the High Criticism. It demands at once the ability of the scholar, and the simplicity of the believing child of God. For without faith no one can explain the Holy Scriptures, and without scholarship no one can investigate historic origins.

There is a Higher Criticism that is at once reverent in tone and scholarly in work. Hengstenberg, the German, and Horne, the Englishman, may be taken as examples. Perhaps the greatest work in English on the Higher Criticism is Horne's Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scripture. It is a work that is simply massive in its scholarship, and invaluable in its vast reach of information for the study of the Holy Scriptures. But Horne's Introduction is too large a work. It is too cumbersome for use in this hurrying age. (Carter's edition in two volumes contains 1,149 pages, and in ordinary book form would contain over 4,000 pages, *i. e.*, about ten volumes of 400 pages each). Latterly, however, it has been edited by Dr. Samuel Davidson, who practically adopted the views of Hupfield and Halle and interpolated not a few of the modern German theories. But Horne's work from first to last is the work of a Christian believer; constructive, not destructive; fortifying faith in the Bible, not rationalistic. But the work of the Higher Critic has not always been pursued in a reverent spirit nor in the spirit of scientific and Christian scholarship.

#### SUBJECTIVE CONCLUSIONS

In the first place, the critics who were the leaders, the men who have given name and

force to the whole movement, have been men who have based their theories largely upon their own subjective conclusions. They have based their conclusions largely upon the very dubious basis of the author's style and supposed literary qualifications. Everybody knows that style is a very unsafe basis for the determination of a literary product. The greater the writer the more versatile his power of expression; and anybody can understand that the Bible is the last book in the world to be studied as a mere classic by mere human scholarship without any regard to the spirit of sympathy and reverence on the part of the student. The Bible, as has been said, has no revelation to make to un-Biblical minds. It does not even follow that because a man is a philological expert he is able to understand the integrity or credibility of a passage of Holy Scripture any more than the beauty and spirit of it.

The qualification for the perception of Biblical truth is neither philosophic nor philological knowledge, but spiritual insight. The primary qualification of the musician is that he be musical; of the artist, that he have the spirit of art. So the merely technical and mechanical and scientific mind is disqualified for the recognition of the spiritual and infinite. Any thoughtful man must honestly admit that the Bible is to be treated as unique in literature, and, therefore, that the ordinary rules of critical interpretation must fail to interpret it aright.

#### GERMAN FANCIES

In the second place, some of the most powerful exponents of the modern Higher Critical theories have been Germans, and it is notorious to what length the German fancy can go in the direction of the subjective and of the conjectural. For hypothesis-weaving and speculation, the German theological professor is unsurpassed. One of the foremost thinkers used to lay it down as a fundamental truth in philosophical and scientific enquiries that no regard whatever should be paid to the conjectures or hypotheses of thinkers, and quoted as an axiom the great Newton himself and his famous words, *Non fingo hypotheses*: I do not frame hypotheses. It is notorious that some of the most learned German thinkers are men who lack in a singular degree the faculty of common sense and knowledge of human nature. Like many physical scientists, they are so preoccupied with a theory that their conclusions seem



to the average mind curiously warped. In fact, a learned man in a letter to Descartes once made an observation which, with slight verbal alteration, might be applied to some of the German critics:

When men sitting in their closet and consulting only their books attempt disquisitions into the Bible, they may indeed tell how they would have made the Book if God had given them that commission. That is, they may describe chimeras which correspond to the fatuity of their own minds, but without an understanding truly Divine they can never form such an idea to themselves as the Deity had in creating it. 'If,' says Matthew Arnold, 'you shut a number of men up to make study and learning the business of their lives, how many of them, from want of some discipline or other, seem to lose all balance of judgment, all common sense.'

The learned professor of Assyriology at Oxford said that the investigation of the literary source of history has been a peculiarly German pastime. It deals with the writers and readers of the ancient Orient as if they were modern German professors, and the attempt to transform the ancient Israelites into somewhat inferior German compilers, proves a strange want of familiarity with Oriental modes of thought (Sayce, *Early History of the Hebrews*, pp.108-112).

#### ANTI-SUPERNATURALISTS

In the third place, the dominant men of the movement were men with a strong bias against the supernatural. This is not an *ex parte* statement at all. It is simply a matter of fact, as we shall presently show. Some of the men who have been most distinguished as the leaders of the Higher Critical movement in Germany and Holland have been men who have no faith in the God of the Bible, and no faith in either the necessity or the possibility of a personal supernatural revelation. The men who have been the voices of the movement, of whom the great majority, less widely known and less influential, have been mere echoes; the men who manufactured the articles the others distributed, have been notoriously opposed to the miraculous.

We must not be misunderstood. We distinctly repudiate the idea that all the Higher Critics were or are anti-supernaturalists. Not so. The British-American School embraces within its ranks many earnest believers. What we do say, as we will presently show, is that the dominant minds which have led and swayed the movement, who made the theories that the others circulated, were strongly unbelieving.

Then the higher critical movement has not followed its true and original purposes in investigating the Scriptures for the purposes of confirming faith and of helping believers to understand the beauties, and appreciate the circumstances of the origin of the various books, and so understand more completely the Bible?

No. It has not; unquestionably it has not. It has been deflected from that, largely owing to the character of the men whose ability and forcefulness have given predominance to their views. It has become identified with a system of criticism which is based on hypotheses and suppositions which have for their object the repudiation of the traditional theology and has investigated the origins and forms and styles and contents, apparently not to confirm the authenticity and credibility and reliability of the Scriptures, but to discredit in most cases their genuineness, to discover discrepancies, and throw doubt upon their authority.

#### THE ORIGIN OF THE MOVEMENT

*Who, then, were the men whose views have moulded the views of the leading teachers and writers of the Higher Critical school of today?*

We will answer this as briefly as possible.

It is not easy to say who is the first so-called Higher Critic, or when the movement began. But it is not modern by any means. Broadly speaking, it has passed through three great stages:

1. The French-Dutch.
2. The German.
3. The British-American.

In its origin it was Franco-Dutch, and speculative, if not sceptical. The views which are now accepted as axiomatic by the Continental and British-American schools of Higher Criticism seem to have been first hinted at by Carlstadt in 1521 in his work on the Canon of Scripture, and by Andreas Masius, a Belgian scholar, who published a commentary on Joshua in 1574, and a Roman Catholic priest, called Peyrere or Pererius, in his *Systematic Theology*, 1660 (LIV. Cap. i).

But it may really be said to have originated with Spinoza, the rationalist Dutch philosopher. In his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* (Cap. vii-viii), 1670, Spinoza came out boldly and impugned the traditional date and Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and



ascribed the origin of the Pentateuch to Ezra or to some other late compiler.

Spinoza was really the fountain-head of the movement, and his line was taken in England by the British philosopher Hobbes. He went deeper than Spinoza, as an outspoken antagonist of the necessity and possibility of a personal revelation, and also denied the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. A few years later a French priest, called Richard Simon of Dieppe, pointed out the supposed varieties of style as indications of various authors in his *Historical Criticism of the Old Testament*, "an epoch-making work." Then another Dutchman, named Clericus (or Le Clerk), in 1685, advocated still more radical views, suggesting an Exilian and priestly authorship for the Pentateuch, and that the Pentateuch was composed by the priest sent from Babylon (2 Kings, 17), about 678, B.C., and also a kind of later editor or redactor theory. Clericus is said to have been the first critic who set forth the theory that Christ and his Apostles did not come into the world to teach the Jews criticism, and that it is only to be expected that their language would be in accordance with the views of the day.

In 1753 a Frenchman named Astruc, a medical man, and reputedly a free-thinker of profligate life, propounded for the first time the Jehovistic and Elohistive divisive hypothesis, and opened a new era (Briggs' *Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, p.46). Astruc said that the use of the two names, Jehovah and Elohim, showed the book was composed of different documents. (The idea of the Holy Ghost employing two words, or one here and another there, or both together as He wills, never seems to enter the thought of the Higher Critic!). His work was called *Conjectures Regarding the Original Memoirs in the Book of Genesis*, and was published in Brussels.

Astruc may be called the father of the documentary theories. He asserted there are traces of no less than ten or twelve different memoirs in the book of Genesis. He denied its Divine authority, and considered the book to be disfigured by useless repetitions, disorder, and contradiction (*Hirschfelder*, p. 66). For fifty years Astruc's theory was unnoticed. The rationalism of Germany was as yet undeveloped, so that the body was not yet prepared to receive the germ, or the soil the weed.

#### THE GERMAN CRITICS

The next stage was largely German. Eichhorn is the greatest name in this period, the eminent Oriental professor at Gottingen who published his work on the Old Testament introduction in 1780. He put into different shape the documentary hypothesis of the Frenchman, and did his work so ably that his views were generally adopted by the most distinguished scholars. Eichhorn's formative influence has been incalculably great. Few scholars refused to do honor to the new sun. It is through him that the name Higher Criticism has become identified with the movement. He was followed by Vater and later by Hartmann with their fragment theory which practically undermined the Mosaic authorship, made the Pentateuch a heap of fragments, carelessly joined by one editor, and paved the way for the most radical of all divisive hypotheses.

In 1806 De Wette, Professor of Philosophy and Theology at Heidelberg, published a work which ran through six editions in four decades. His contribution to the introduction of the Old Testament instilled the same general principles as Eichhorn, and in the supplemental hypotheses assumed that Deuteronomy was composed in the age of Josiah (2 Kings 22:8). Not long after, Vatke and Leopold George (both Hegelians) unreservedly declared the post-Mosaic and post-prophetic origin of the first four books of the Bible. Then came Bleek, who advocated the idea of the *Grundschrift* or original document and the redactor theory; and then Ewald, the father of the Crystallization theory; and then Hupfield (1853), who held that the original document was an independent compilation; and Graf, who wrote a book on the historical books of the Old Testament in 1866 and advocated the theory that the Jehovistic and Elohistive documents were written hundreds of years after Moses' time. Graf was a pupil of Reuss, the redactor of the Ezra hypothesis of Spinoza.

Then came a most influential writer, Professor Kuenen of Leyden in Holland, whose work on the Hexateuch was edited by Colenso in 1865, and his *Religion of Israel and Prophecy in Israel*, published in England in 1874-1877. Kuenen was one of the most advanced exponents of the rationalistic school. Last, but not least, of the continental Higher Critics is Julius Wellhausen, who at one time was a theological professor in Germany, who



published in 1878 the first volume of his history of Israel, and won by his scholarship the attention if not the allegiance of a number of leading theologians (See *Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, Green, pp.59-88).

It will be observed that nearly all these authors were Germans, and most of them professors of philosophy or theology.

#### THE BRITISH-AMERICAN CRITICS

The third stage of the movement is the British-American. The best known names are those of Dr. Samuel Davidson, whose *Introduction to the Old Testament*, published in 1862, was largely based on the fallacies of the German rationalists. The supplementary hypothesis passed over into England through him and with strange incongruity, he borrowed frequently from Baur. Dr. Robertson Smith, the Scotchman, recast the German theories in an English form in his works on the Pentateuch, the Prophets of Israel, and the Old Testament in the Jewish Church, first published in 1881, and followed the German school, according to Briggs, with great boldness and thoroughness. A man of deep piety and high spirituality, he combined with a sincere regard for the Word of God a critical radicalism that was strangely inconsistent, as did also his namesake, George Adam Smith, the most influential of the present-day leaders, a man of great insight and scriptural acumen, who in his works on Isaiah, and the twelve prophets, adopted some of the most radical and least demonstrable of the German theories, and in his later work, *Modern Criticism and the Teaching of the Old Testament*, has gone still farther in the rationalistic direction.

Another well-known Higher Critic is Dr. S. R. Driver, the Regius professor of Hebrew at Oxford, who, in his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, published ten years later, and his work on the Book of Genesis, has elaborated with remarkable skill and great detail of analysis the theories and views of the continental school. Driver's work is able, very able, but it lacks originality and English independence. The hand is the hand of Driver, but the voice is the voice of Kuenen or Wellhausen.

The third well-known name is that of Dr. C. A. Briggs, for some time Professor of Biblical Theology in the Union Theological Seminary of New York. An equally earnest advocate of the German theories, he pub-

lished in 1883 his *Biblical Study*; in 1886, his *Messianic Prophecy*, and a little later his *Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch*. Briggs studied the Pentateuch, as he confesses, under the guidance chiefly of Ewald (*Hexateuch*, p.63).

Of course, this list is a very partial one, but it gives most of the names that have become famous in connection with the movement, and the reader who desires more will find a complete summary of the literature of the Higher Criticism in Professor Bissell's work on the Pentateuch (Scribner's, 1892). Briggs, in his *Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch* (Scribner's, 1897), gives an historical summary also.

We must now investigate another question, and that is the religious views of the men most influential in this movement. In making the statement that we are about to make, we desire to deprecate entirely the idea of there being anything uncharitable, unfair, or unkind, in stating what is simply a matter of fact.

#### THE VIEWS OF THE CONTINENTAL CRITICS

Regarding the views of the Continental Critics, three things can be confidently asserted of nearly all, it not all, of the real leaders.

1. They were men who denied the validity of miracle, and the validity of any miraculous narrative. What Christians consider to be miraculous they considered legendary or mythical; "legendary exaggeration of events that are entirely explicable from natural causes."

2. They were men who denied the reality of prophecy and the validity of any prophetic statement. What Christians have been accustomed to consider prophetic, they called dexterous conjectures, coincidences, fiction, or imposture.

3. They were men who denied the reality of revelation, in the sense in which it has ever been held by the universal Christian Church. They were avowed unbelievers of the supernatural. Their theories were excogitated on pure grounds of human reasoning. Their hypotheses were constructed on the assumption of the falsity of Scripture. As to the inspiration of the Bible, as to the Holy Scriptures from Genesis to Revelation being the Word of God, they had no such belief. We may take them one by one. Spinoza repudiated absolutely a supernatural revela-



tion. And Spinoza was one of their greatest. Eichhorn discarded the miraculous, and considered that the so-called supernatural element was an Oriental exaggeration; and Eichhorn has been called the father of Higher Criticism, and was the first man to use the term. De Wette's views as to inspiration were entirely infidel. Vatke and Leopold George were Hegelian rationalists, and regarded the first four books of the Old Testament as entirely mythical. Kuenen, says Professor Sanday, wrote in the interests of an almost avowed Naturalism. That is, he was a free-thinker, an agnostic; a man who did not believe in the Revelation of the one true and living God (*Brampton Lectures*, 1893, p.117). He wrote from an avowedly naturalistic standpoint, says Driver (p.205). According to Wellhausen the religion of Israel was a naturalistic evolution from heathendom, an emanation from an imperfectly monotheistic kind of semi-pagan idolatry. It was simply a human religion.

#### THE LEADERS WERE RATIONALISTS

In one word, the formative forces of the Higher Critical movement were rationalistic forces, and the men who were its chief authors and expositors, who "on account of purely philological criticism have acquired an appalling authority," were men who had discarded belief in God and Jesus Christ Whom He had sent. The Bible, in their view, was a mere human product. It was a stage in the literary evolution of a religious people. If it was not the resultant of a fortuitous concourse of Oriental myths and legendary accretions, and its Jahveh or Jahweh, the ex-cogitation of a Sinaitic clan, it certainly was not given by the inspiration of God. "Holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," said Peter. "God, who at sundry times and in diverse manners spake by the prophets," said Paul. Not so, said Kuenen; the prophets were not moved to speak by God. Their utterances were all their own (Sanday, p.117).

These then were their views and these were the views that have so dominated modern Christianity and permeated modern ministerial thought in the two great languages of the modern world. We cannot say that they were men whose rationalism was the result of their conclusions in the study of the Bible. Nor can we say their conclusions with regard to the Bible were wholly the result

of their rationalism. But we can say, on the one hand, that inasmuch as they refused to recognize the Bible as a direct revelation from God, they were free to form hypotheses *ad libitum*. And, on the other hand, as they denied the supernatural, the animus that animated them in the construction of the hypotheses was the desire to construct a theory that would explain away the supernatural. Unbelief was the antecedent, not the consequent, of their criticism.

Now there is nothing unkind in this. There is nothing that is uncharitable, or unfair. It is simply a statement of fact which modern authorities most freely admit.

#### THE SCHOOL OF COMPROMISE

When we come to the English-writing Higher Critics, we approach a much more difficult subject. The *British-American Higher Critics* represent a school of compromise. On the one hand they practically accept the premises of the Continental school with regard to the antiquity, authorship, authenticity, and origins of the Old Testament books. On the other hand, they refuse to go with the German rationalists in altogether denying their inspiration. They still claim to accept the Scriptures as containing a Revelation from God. But may they not hold their own peculiar views with regard to the origin and date and literary structure of the Bible without endangering either their own faith or the faith of Christians? This is the very heart of the question, and, in order that the reader may see the seriousness of the adoption of the conclusions of the critics, as brief a resumé as possible of the matter will be given.

#### THE POINT IN A NUTSHELL

According to the faith of the universal church, the Pentateuch, that is, the first five books of the Bible, is one consistent, coherent, authentic and genuine composition, inspired by God, and, according to the testimony of the Jews, the statements of the books themselves, the reiterated corroborations of the rest of the Old Testament, and the explicit statement of the Lord Jesus (Luke 24:44, John 5:46,47) was written by Moses (with the exception, of course, of Deut. 34, possibly written by Joshua, as the Talmud states, or probably by Ezra) at a period of about fourteen centuries before the advent of Christ, and 800 years or so before Jeremiah. It is, moreover, a portion of the



Bible that is of paramount importance, for it is the basic substratum of the whole revelation of God, and of paramount value, not because it is merely the literature of an ancient nation, but because it is the introductory section of the Word of God, bearing His authority and given by inspiration through His servant Moses. That is the faith of the Church.

#### THE CRITICS' THEORY

But according to the Higher Critics:

1. The Pentateuch consists of four completely diverse documents. These completely different documents were the primary sources of the composition which they call the Hexateuch: (a) The Yahwist or Jahvist, (b) the Elohist, (c) the Deuteronomist, and (d) the Priestly Code, the *Grund-schrift*, the work of the first Elohist (Sayce Hist. Heb., 103), now generally known as J. E. D. P., and for convenience designated by these symbols.

2. These different works were composed at various periods of time, not in the fifteenth century, B.C., but in the ninth, seventh, sixth and fifth centuries; J. and E. being referred approximately to about 800 to 700 B.C., D to about 650 to 625 B.C., and P. to about 525 to 425 B.C. According to the Graf theory, accepted by Kuenen, the Elohist documents were post-exilian, that is, they were written only five centuries or so before Christ. Genesis and Exodus as well as the Priestly Code, that is, Leviticus and part of Exodus and Numbers were also post-exilic.

3. These different works, moreover, represent different traditions of the national life of the Hebrews, and are at variance in most important particulars.

4. And, further. They conjecture that these four suppositive documents were not compiled and written by Moses, but were probably constructed somewhat after this fashion: For some reason, and at some time, and in some way, some one, no one knows who, or why, or when, or where, wrote J. Then someone else, on one knows who, or why, or when, or where, wrote another document, which is now called E. And then at a later time, the critics only know who, or why, or when, or where, an anonymous personage, whom we may call Redactor I, took in hand the reconstruction of these documents, introduced new material, harmonized the real and apparent discrepancies, and divided the inconsistent accounts of one event into two

separate transactions. Then some time after this, perhaps one hundred years of more, no one knows who, or why, or when, or where, some anonymous personage wrote another document, which they style D. And after a while another anonymous author, no one knows who, or why, or when, or where, whom we will call Redactor II, took this in hand, compared it with J. E., revised J. E., with considerable freedom, and in addition introduced quite a body of new material. Then some one else, no one knows who, or why, or when, or where, probably, however, about 525, or perhaps 425, wrote P.; and then another anonymous Hebrew, whom we may call Redactor III, undertook to incorporate this with the triplicated composite J. E. D., with what they call redactional additions and insertions (Green, p.88, cf. Sayce, *Early History of the Hebrews*, pp.100-105).

It may be well to state at this point that this is not an exaggerated statement of the Higher Critical position. On the contrary, we have given here what has been described as a position "established by proofs, valid and cumulative" and "representing the most sober scholarship." The more advanced continental Higher Critics, Green says, distinguish the writers of the primary sources according to the supposed elements as J1 and J2, E1 and E2, P1, P2 and P3, and D1 and D2, nine different originals in all. The different Redactors, technically described by the symbol R., are Rj., who combined J and E.; Rd., who added D. to J. E., and Rh., who completed the Hexateuch by combining P. with J.E.D. (*H.C. of the Pentateuch*, p.88).

#### A DISCREDITED PENTATEUCH

5. These four suppositive documents are, moreover, alleged to be internally inconsistent and undoubtedly incomplete. How far they are incomplete they do not agree. How much is missing and when, where, how and by whom it was removed; whether it was some thief who stole, or copyist who tampered, or editor who falsified, they do not declare.

6. In this redactory process no limit apparently is assigned by the critic to the work of the redactors. With an utter irresponsibility of freedom it is declared that they inserted misleading statements with the purpose of reconciling incompatible traditions; that they amalgamated what should have been distinguished, and sundered that which should have amalgamated. In one word,



it is an axiomatic principle of the divisive hypothesizers that the redactors "have not only misapprehended, but misrepresented the originals" (Green, p.170). They were animated by "egotistical motives." They confused varying accounts, and erroneously ascribed them to different occasions. They not only gave false and colored impressions; they destroyed valuable elements of the suppositive documents and tampered with the dismantled remnant.

7. And worst of all. The Higher Critics are unanimous in the conclusion that these documents contain three species of material:

- (a) The probably true.
- (b) The certainly doubtful.
- (c) The positively spurious.

The narratives of the Pentateuch are usually trustworthy, though partly mythical and legendary. The miracles recorded were the exaggerations of a later age (Davidson, *Introduction*, p.131).

The framework of the first eleven chapters of Genesis, says George Adam Smith in his *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament*, is woven from the raw material of myth and legend. He denies their historical character, and says that he can find no proof in archæology for the personal existence of characters of the Patriarchs themselves. Later on, however, in a fit of apologetic repentance he makes the condescending admission that it is extremely probable that the stories of the Patriarchs have at the heart of them historical elements (pp.90-106).

Such is the view of the Pentateuch that is accepted as conclusive by "the sober scholarship" of a number of the leading theological writers and professors of the day. It is to this the Higher Criticism reduces what the Lord Jesus called the writings of Moses.

## Has Man a Dual Mind?

W. MASLIN FRYINGER, D.D.

### Ambiguous Theories

**M**ANY psychologists attempt to explain psychic phenomena by attributing to man a dual mind. F. H. W. Myers divides the mind into the supraliminal and the subliminal.

Dr. Albert Moll makes the distinction of the primary and secondary consciousness, as does Prof. James, the latter designating this secondary consciousness as an independent intelligence, a "splitoff, limited and buried, but yet a fully conscious self."

Thos. J. Hudson divides the mind into two distinct and separate entities, ascribing to them different functions, powers, and abilities. He qualifies this hypothesis, however, by saying that "it is a matter of indifference whether we consider that man is endowed with two distinct minds, or that his one mind possesses certain attributes and powers under some conditions and certain other attributes and powers under other conditions."

A. B. Olson says that the therapeutic value of mental suggestion is not a question of whether there are two minds, and yet insists that success in auto-suggestion depends on the objective mind believing in and trusting the subjective mind. "We shall leave to others," he says, "to discuss the matter of

mind unity with a view to settling the question"—and then he predicates his whole theory of mental therapeutics on the assumption that the objective and subjective minds are entities, assigning the seat of the former to the brain and that of the latter to the nerve centers controlling the bodily functions.

Other authors advance still other theories, differing from those already noticed and more or less from each other. I am inclined to think the following considerations refute the theory of a dual mind.

### IT LACKS DEFINITENESS

No two authors advocating it agrees as to the exact nature and functions of the two mental entities they ascribe to man. Some are so wide apart in their definitions that they contradict each other.

Hudson makes only reason and memory faculties of the objective mind, and intuition, susceptibility to suggestion, perfect reasoning, perfect memory, the emotions, telepathic powers, and kinetic energy attributes of the subjective mind.

Olson, on the contrary, invests both the objective and subjective minds with the faculties ordinarily attributed to the normal mental structure, but gives to the subjective



superior powers. "The subjective mind is a perfect memory," he says, and "it has resources for obtaining information not shared by the objective mind." He gives the subjective mind alone kinetic power, but puts it under control of the objective mind, saying, "The subjective mind receives its education from the objective mind."

It is impossible to bring harmony out of all this confusion as to statement. Each theory lacks scientific accuracy.

#### IT IS FOUNDED ON A WRONG ASSUMPTION

This wrong assumption has reference to what constitutes human personality. Olson says, on the first page of *Mind Power and Privileges*, that mind makes man, and emphasizes this statement by saying further, "Mind . . . is true and permanent individuality." He thus makes mind an embodiment of all human powers. This is essentially the materialistic conception of man's individuality, which asserts that mind is but a manifestation of organized matter, and when the organism ceases to exist the mind ceases to exist.

Olson agrees with Hudson, that "Cerebral anatomy conclusively demonstrates the fact that there can be no objective mind in the absence of a brain." Both seem to disagree with Prof. Bergson, a former President of the British Society for Psychical Research, who says: "The brain simply extracts from the life of the mind that which is capable of representation in movement. The cerebral is to the mental life what the movements of the baton of a conductor are to the symphony."

And they totally disagree with the eminent scientific authorities who still endorse what Tyndall declared in his Belfast Address: "You cannot satisfy the human understanding in its demand for logical continuity between molecular processes and the phenomena of the human mind."

Olson seems to transfer the permanency of individuality, or immortality, to the subconscious mind, but he makes it dependent on the physical organism also, for while he regards this inner mind the active agent in operating the bodily functions; he makes the medulla, the spinal cord, and the nerve ganglia the media on which its operations depend, if indeed he does not make its very existence depend on these organs, as he says the ex-

istence of the objective mind depends upon the brain. He carries the materialistic conception so far as to invest even the infinitesimal cells which compose the body with intelligence. All of which is consistent with his general theory concerning man's personality only on the ground that his vague definition of mind is correct, that it is "a sort of ever existing background of intelligence"—a definition which makes both mind and man but mere shadows.

It matters not whether the conscious or subconscious mind is made to constitute man's personality, the presumption in either case is entirely wrong. There is no conscious mind and no subconscious mind. By which we mean that consciousness does not inhere in mind—that the power to cognize mental operations lies back of the mind.

#### WHAT IS THE MIND?

Mind is a word of very indefinite meaning. It can be used only in the abstract. It is generally employed to express the rational faculty, man's power to reason. It is sometimes used to denote all of man's powers, to take in his entire spiritual nature, as a synonym of the soul (See Webster). This only makes its meaning more vague, but it is only when thus used that it can be said that the mind constitutes human personality.

Now, those who attribute to man a dual mind use the term as designating either the rational faculty alone or man's entire spiritual nature. Hudson uses the objective mind in the former sense and the subjective mind in the latter. He attributes only reason and memory to the one, and "perfect reason" and "perfect memory" to the other, thus closely approaching Mrs. Eddy's remarkable definition of mortal mind as "nothing, claiming to be something."

Olson is not as specific as Hudson, leaving definitions to the metaphysicians. Both practically assign to man a dual mind and a dual personality, and make his present life a sort of Jekyll-and-Hyde existence. They present a vague theory, because they base it on the interpretation of human personality expressed in the vague meaning given to mind when used to denote the whole of man's powers instead of one class only.

#### THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY

There has recently arisen a new school of psychologists who are assuming to be authorities on the subject; but their theories are



so immature that they hardly commend themselves as being scientific. They eliminate consciousness altogether, and make of the mind and body a duality in action but a unit in results obtained. They attribute thought and reason to physical origin, and make bodily states and mental states one and the same. All psychic phenomena, according to their teaching, are mechanistic and materialistic. Like their predecessors to whom we have already alluded, they differ from each other to such an extent that no one of their theories can be accepted.

Paralleism, of which there are three different hypotheses, (the radical, the double aspect, and the idealistic), Pragmatism, Behaviorism, and other mere speculative assumptions, are all contradictory of each other. Some of our ablest thinkers, like Professors Pratt, Roback, Buckham, Keyser, McDougall, and others, are exposing the superficiality of these views which in this age of sensationalism pass for scientific utterances, so we need say no more about them.

#### MAN IS MORE THAN A THINKING MACHINE

Have not both anthropology and psychology assumed a definiteness which enables us to outline man's nature with accuracy? Do we not know that he is more than a reasoning being—more than a mere thinking machine, which is all materialism makes him? He is also an emotional being, a moral being, a volitional being. But, when we have said all this, we have not fixed his personality.

Some would make mind constitute personality, and bring all the achievements of the intellect to support their theory. Some would make the emotions the measure of personality, claiming that it could wear no more enduring crown than love. Some would make moral characteristics the distinguishing manifestation of personality, on the ground that the right or wrong use of all human powers depends upon these. Some would say with Emerson, "Personality resides in the will," and this belief is gaining acceptance among the agnostics and materialists especially.

In Munsterberg's *Psychology and Life* man's whole life is defined in terms of the will. But in no one or all of these manifestations of personality does personality itself consist. Man is a conscious being. He may be divested of any one of the attributes he

possesses, even the rational faculty, and still remain a conscious being. Consciousness inheres in the ego, in the real self, in the spirit. And the conscious ego constitutes personal existence, the only personality. Personality is not a manifestation of mind, or of the emotions, or of moral characteristics, or even of will-power, but all of these are manifestations of personality.

I do not dispute the therapeutic value of mental suggestion, nor the extraordinary facts which are to be accredited as psychic phenomena, but I am sure the theory of a dual mind does not explain them. Another theory, based on man's spiritual personality, is far more rational and more easily harmonized with the belief that man is an immortal being.

As to the question of a subconscious mind, I think those who have given it the impartial consideration I have tried to give it will agree with me that Prof. Munsterberg is right in saying, "The story of the subconscious mind can be told in three words: *There is none.*"

*Healdsburg, California*

### Alphabetical Maxims

Attend carefully to details of your business;  
Be prompt in all things;  
Consider well, then decide positively;  
Dare to do right, fear to do wrong;  
Endure trials patiently;  
Fight life's battles bravely, manfully;  
Go not into the society of the vicious;  
Hold integrity sacred;  
Injure not another's reputation, nor business;  
Join hands only with the virtuous;  
Keep your mind from evil thoughts;  
Lie not for any consideration;  
Make few acquaintances;  
Never try to appear what you are not;  
Observe good manners;  
Pay your debts promptly;  
Question not the veracity of a friend;  
Respect the counsel of your parents;  
Sacrifice money rather than principle;  
Touch not, taste not, handle not intoxicating drinks;  
Use your leisure time for improvement;  
Venture not upon the threshold of wrong;  
Watch carefully over your passions;  
Extend to everyone a kindly salutation;  
Yield not to discouragement;  
Zealously labor for the right.

—Baron Rothchild.

The most amazing event in human history, is the actual personal arrival of Christ on earth,—God manifest in the flesh for our salvation. He came once as predicted; He is to come again as predicted. He will make us ready.—Rev. George H. Lee.



# The League of Evangelical Students

## *The Seventh Annual Conference*

REVEREND HAROLD JOHN OCKENGA, B.A.

ONCE again the student delegations from forty colleges, universities, and seminaries met for mutual strengthening and encouragement along the lines of evangelical Christianity. Seven years ago some laughed as the organization was formed in protest to the open unbelief and destructive teaching in schools of higher learning. These same individuals are now becoming more serious as they watch the power and steadfast progress of this League. Students who felt its influence and molding force in their school days are now entering positions of leadership as professors and preachers. No longer can the charge be made that the thought life of this group is forced upon it from without. The secretary of the League who is a former college professor, and the entertaining ministers of this conference were all trained under League influence. This bespeaks a homogeneous and unified program for the future.

Delegations from Maine, Minnesota, Texas and Canada, and from the regions between gathered at the Point Breeze Presbyterian Church and the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh this February. One of the most impressive services of the conference consisted of a witness program participated in by the members of these delegations. "We are a group of twenty in a school of fourteen thousand," said one, "but all the students have not been faced with the issue. It is our purpose to do that very thing." Another testified that it was the only organization to which one could turn at his school to even have this phase of the truth presented. "Our group sends out teams to other schools and to churches to testify and preach the real gospel," said still another. And the present writer was shown a theological book that one young law student was reading which was a classic on certain lines of truth. It was heavy enough to strain the intellect of the most advanced students of Christianity, yet here he was revelling in its contents. Where do such convictions and interests arise? They come partly from the Evangelical Student which is the official organ of the League, partly from its conferences, and partly from

the books of its leaders and sponsors. The thinking student who is in touch with these sources of spiritual thought will naturally be alive to present day religious issues.

One student suggested at the Conference that the League must be more apologetic, it must primarily develop Christian thought and then evangelistic endeavor will follow. That student was absolutely correct. It is right thinking that impels to action. The church and the League must not be static in its witness but on the other hand an enthusiastic effort for a half truth or for some error is a drag on any attempt to meet the need of this hour in the student world. Only apologetic preaching and testimony can be evangelistic. Only a sermon that leaves one with no other alternative but an acceptance of Christ as the Son of God and the Substitution for sin will ever bring permanent results. Spiritual emotions, personal admiration, and mystical experience is soon over. Without a system of knowledge and doctrine effects would soon be effaced. We who are interested may thank God that the League of Students recognizes this salient fact.

The opening address of this conference was delivered by Dr. R. J. McKnight who in no uncertain tones defined the great issue in the church today. It is a question of "shields of brass or of gold." The brass may be as excellent in appearance for a season, but the lasting worth is gone. Modernism is substituting for the gold of truth an alloy of error. From this address on to the closing sessions of the Conference when Dr. J. G. Machen and Dr. Melvin Grove Kyle spoke, great intellectual and spiritual instruments were put in the hands of these students to carry them through the year. The program was balanced in interest and in scope. Missionaries such as Dr. Charles E. Scott and Rev. W. B. Hunt, professors like Dr. L. S. Keyser and Dr. L. S. Chafer, and pastors such as Dr. C. E. Macartney and Dr. W. W. Weller addressed the group. On the whole the officers seemed to think that the conference was the largest in attendance and greatest in influence and benefit of any yet held.



Some schools that are thoroughly evangelical hesitate to join this League because it will not do them much good for they already believe and have fellowship with those who believe these truths. One such school testified that it never realized what tremendous good it could accomplish for others and in turn what visions of usefulness it could get till this conference. The stronger in members such an organization can become and still keep purity of purpose the greater its fruit bearing power shall be. On the last morning communion was celebrated by the entertaining church for its members and the delegates. At that hour a real mystical fellowship was felt with that noble company of prophets, apostles, martyrs and saints who through the ages have believed in, contented for, lived in and died for those great principles and doctrines of the Bible which form the basis of the organization of the League of Evangelical Students.

*Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania*

## Founder's Week Echoes

WILLIAM M. RUNYAN

THE usual conference honoring the birthday of D. L. Moody, the founder of The Moody Bible Institute of Chicago, was omitted last year because of the widening of La Salle Street. Eager multitudes responded to the call of the President of the Institute, Dr. James M. Gray, to re-assemble this year from February 1 to 5, at the famous old Bible training school, for prayer, Bible study, and the enkindling of missionary and evangelistic zeal. The call was answered by visitors from twenty-nine states of the Union and some ten foreign lands, while the response from the Chicago area swelled the attendance to the filling of three over-flow auditoriums equipped with amplifier connections. "A double portion of God's Spirit poured forth," was the general verdict of those who had been present on former occasions and sensed the even greater spiritual impact of this one.

Professor Samuel M. Zwemer, Ph.D., of Princeton, known as the apostle to Islam, from long years of missionary labors in Mohammedan lands, delivered the keynote address from the theme, "The Founder and the Foundation." From Hebrews 1:10, with the insight of broad scholarship, he brought answer to the question, "How great is Jesus

Christ?" "To the New Testament writers Christ was Lord of all, or not Lord at all. In no book of the New Testament are statements regarding the eternal and absolute deity of Christ more strongly asserted than in the Epistle to the Hebrews." Christ as Creator with the Father of the starry host of heaven was established by many incontrovertible scriptures.

Dr. H. A. Ironside, pastor of Moody Memorial Church, Chicago, was expositor for the prophetic hour, lucidly interpreting the teaching of the Scriptures bearing on the Second Coming of Christ as related to "The Jew," "The Church," and "The Rapture." "There is but one explanation of a passage of Scripture, though there may be many applications," said Dr. Ironside, and he was careful to distinguish between true and consistent explanations and many possible applications.

Dr. P. W. Philpott, whose forty years of ministry have been devoted to the pastorates of but three churches, the last two being the Moody Memorial Church of Chicago, and the Church of the Open Door, Los Angeles, was fittingly assigned to the "inspirational hour," delivering five characteristic addresses, chief among which was "What Christ Claimed for Himself," answering with clarity and spiritual power the demand, "If thou be the Son of God, tell us plainly."

Dr. Charles G. Trumbull, editor of *The Sunday School Times*, spoke on "Surrender" and "Trust" as representing steps to victory. "I wonder if any of us who are in this meeting has ever presumed on God's grace to enable us to go on in sin." These two addresses, on consecutive days, delivered in the earnest and subdued manner of the well-known speaker, made clear that in Jesus is true victory over sin, for "He shall save His people from their sins." A deep hunger for more grace and true deliverance was engendered.

Dr. Robert G. Lee, pastor of the Bellevue Baptist Church, Memphis, Tenn., came with the fervor and eloquence of the Southern orator and captivated the conference in three messages. "Jesus: Consider Him" was perhaps the most movingly impressive. Jesus was considered (1) as the pre-existent Christ made flesh; (2) as the worker of miracles, Himself a miracle greater than any He performed; (3) as teacher, speaking as never man spake, and, finally, as the crucified



and risen Saviour of mankind. "Jesus expressed the complete thought of God fully and adequately, and uttered it once and for all with such precision and finality that the inspired apostle had to say by the Holy Ghost, 'The Word was God.'"

"Child Evangelism" had its enthusiastic proponent in Miss Frances C. Bennett, and "Bible Work for Women" in the well-known Bible teacher, Miss Grace Saxe.

Large place was given to the missionary message, both the Home and Foreign responsibilities of the church being thrillingly set forth. Miss Lucy Waller Peet reported spiritual victories in the Blue Ridge mountains of the South, the power of God unto salvation among lonely inhabitants of the hills. Rev. John Hamel pictured the claims of the forest folk and the pioneer of the North, a convincing message, declaring that missionary aspirants who could not go to a foreign field, or were too old to learn a strange tongue, could well consider this field as a "call from Macedonia." Optimistic reports of work among the Jews marked the utterances of both Charles P. Meeker and David Bronstein, each in the Chicago field.

More distant places of earth had representatives in missionaries of unusual distinction. Dr. Charles Ernest Scott, from thirty years of residence in China under direction of the Presbyterian (U. S. A.) Board, could speak with authority on past and present problems in that land of mystery. He has been painfully aware of the soviet propaganda of Communism, and rates it as the greatest and most audacious enemy of the gospel message. However, he declared that helping to assuage hunger and caring for their physical ills win many of the Chinese to the Christian religion. He regards these as telling weapons for fighting Communism, because the promise of rations and health appeals to the poverty-stricken natives.

Rev. W. J. Hanna, of Canada, one of the leading lights of the China Inland Mission, also a missionary of thirty years tenure, told of a year given to an extensive survey of Manchuria. With this region so much in the public mind, his words were of compelling interest. "While Japan has rightfully contested the Chinese refusal to recognize treaty rights, the militaristic element has over-stepped itself in the Shanghai tragedy. Japan has little chance to conquer China, for

the Chinese national pride is exceptional, and the almost unlimited man-power of China would be a terrific obstacle to overcome."

Paul W. Harrison, M.D., went out to Arabia 22 years ago, representing the Reformed Church in America. His practice of medicine, hospital work, and extensive travel in the Moslem world have conspired to give him a profound understanding of the appalling difficulty of bringing the Moslem into such knowledge of Christ as shall eventually mean his regeneration. Loneliness, ostracism, persecution, await the convert. Those who have braved all for the Cross of Christ, against the dominance of the Sword and Crescent, constitute indeed a band of heroes. This message in its strong and logical defining of need and condition stirred a great audience at the Thursday night session.

Mrs. Arthur F. Tylee, whose husband and baby girl rest in martyrs' graves in Matto Grosso, Brazil, spoke with profound insight and understanding of the problem of revealing Christ to the Nambiquara Indians of that region, a people without written language, and entrenched behind walls of age-long superstition. This elect sister goes bravely on, under a blessing of great spiritual unction, pleading the cause of these people among whom she had lived for five years before the fiery ordeal came upon her home, out of which she barely escaped with her life, and which cost the lives of her own dear ones, and also that of Miss Mildred Kratz, the consecrated nurse, who had been upon the field but a few weeks.

On the platform for the Missionary Symposium were veterans in service, and younger missionaries, from China, Japan, Africa, Brazil, Venezuela, Argentina, India, Arabia, Madagascar, and Guatemala. The two-hour period will live in memory and the recounting of experiences of brother workers must contribute cheer and courage to those who are the most beset by Satan's rage.

The entire conference was enriched by seasons of intercession, services of song and praise, and especially was the fellowship of hundreds of former students of the Institute inspirational and heartening. No former conference has presented more effectually the many-sided interests of Christian doctrine and service, and eager anticipation of a conference for next year was inspiringly audible.

Chicago



# For Your Scrap Book

REVEREND A. WALLACE COPPER, B.A.

## The Reality of the Invisible

IT is evident to any scientist there are some things which cannot be seen that have a basis in reality. No person has ever seen an atom and certainly not an electron or a proton. The scientist, however, is confident of their existence. How does he know they exist if he or no one else has ever seen them? He is confident of their existence because of their reactions and effects upon the world of matter. It is from their reactions that their reality has been deduced.

One day David Livingstone started from the heart of Africa to the coast. He took thirty natives with him who had never before gone beyond the boundaries of their own little village. At first they did not want to go for terrible things, they were told, existed in the outside world. They consented to go only when Livingstone promised to bring them back safely again to their home. Day after day they gave expression of their love for their own little village. Suddenly, it seemed, they were climbing the hills looking over Loanda to the sea. When they saw the wide expanse of the ocean they were greatly confused. One of them declared, "We were taught there was no end to the world. We had no sooner climbed those hills of Loanda than it seemed the world suddenly said, "I am finished."

For several weeks David Livingstone lay in the British commissioner's house in Loanda in the clutches of a terrible fever. It seemed for a while, when he was unable to move hand or foot, that life was slowly ebbing away. However, in spite of the handicap of weakness he regained his health. An English ship rested in the harbor. The British commissioner offered Livingstone passage home. That was a great offer to a man who had not seen his wife and children for two years. Home meant not only family but fame and praise and glory. But, without a moment's hesitation he refused it. What about these natives and his promise to take them home? The morning the boat was to sail he took aboard his charts and invaluable maps. That

afternoon he and his native friends stood on the banks of Loanda and watched the boat go out to sea. Then without a word they turned and silently went back and were soon lost in the forest. What was it that forced David Livingstone to go back? What was it that kept him from accepting the passage that would have brought him into the loving arms of his waiting family? What was it that forbade him to go after years in a jungle; estranged from civilization? It is not too much to say it was honor. It is not too much to say it was truth.

Has any man ever seen honor? Has any man ever seen truth? No man has ever seen honor and truth any more than he has seen an atom or an electron or a proton. How does he know that truth and honor exist? Well, how does he know the atom exists? How does he know truth and honor have a basis in reality? He knows that truth and honor exist and have a basis in reality for the same reason that he knows the atom exists and has a basis in reality. He knows of their reality by their reactions and effect upon life and personality. Truth and honor given a chance can enable men to do what they otherwise would and could never do.

*Philadelphia*

## Life\*

LIFE is omnipresent. It is found everywhere. Even though there are no fishes in the Great Salt Lake, no birds swimming on the surface, yet there are brine shrimps and two or three more living creatures tenanted its dense waters. Little fresh water snails may be seen creeping on stones close to the brink of Niagara Falls. An army of a million wingless insects has been observed crossing the Mer-de-Glace near Chamonix.

There are insects that run about on the surface of the open sea. There are many animals that find their home in coal pits. It seems there are no corners in which living creatures have not explored. From the great abyss of the deep sea, miles below the sur-

\*The Haunts of Life by J. A. Thompson.

face to near the summits of the Alps. From the floating icebergs in the north to beneath ten feet of ice on the Antarctic shore there are always some living creatures trying to explore a new kingdom.

The masses of rock which often run far out to sea. Their top and seaward surfaces are exposed the greater part of the day to the violence of the wind and the heat of the sun. The water rises and the waves beat against them. Yet these have their inhabitants. In them are little pools of water and each pool harbors a crowded life. The sands of the sea have their own population. The

mud flats formed at river mouths have their inhabitants.

## Exploring the Sea

THE naturalists who go down ten or fifteen feet or even as far as the sea floor at certain places discover there are wonders even in the sea. Each creature has its favorite and habitual corner to which it is habitually suited. Different fishes tenant the same place at different times, thus when evening approaches the day feeding fishes disappear and out of the recesses of the reef come the night fishes.

# Young People's Department

REVEREND HAROLD JOHN OCKENGA, B.A.

## Topic for May 8

### What is the Basis of Society?

#### The Parent-Child Relationship

Scripture—Ex.20:12. Eph.6:1-9.

THE basis of society is the family. This is the one unit upon which all civilized relationships are constructed. Any attempt to strike at the family is an attempt to revolutionize society. From Plato's Republic to the modern communistic theories of Russia any unit of society other than the family has proved itself ineffectual.

Almost universally man has been the head of the family and the state. The reason for the supremacy of the man is given in the Scripture. Woman was made as a helpmate for man. Under the natural relationship man was supreme and there was nothing derogatory about the fact. But at the entrance of sin, when woman usurped the authority of the man, she was, by the command of God, placed in subjection to him which was an unnatural subjection, and, therefore, something very much disliked by the woman. Man was not only the head of the woman in the beginning, but he was also the head of the family. He was God's representative among men who was to be both legislator and priest. In this way absolute authority was committed unto him over those who were in his care. This was not merely superiority due to the fact that he knew more or was better, but it was an authority delegated to him by God.

#### 1. Authority in the Home

In most of our comic papers, today, we have a cartoon which clearly depicts conditions by its very title, "Bringing Up Father." To take the words at their face value is to make them meaningless, but to understand them as a comic portrayal of the reversed processes of life is to get their meaning. Such a comic would be impossible were it not that the natural order of human relationships is reversed.

Primarily, this Commandment deals with the attitude of children toward parents. However, it also implies certain great facts in the attitude of parents toward children. Let me speak of them first. There is a prevalent idea today among certain married people of the upper classes that it is foolishness to have children, or at the most, more than one or two. Living conditions in the cities are becoming more and more adverse to family life, and many are taking the avenue of least resistance. At a convention of doctors in Indianapolis, who were graduates of a certain medical school, a survey was taken. It was found that among thirty-four doctors of one class, there were only two children, whereas a like survey of a similar number of men, deficient in mind or body, now inmates of a county hospital, showed that there were seventy-two children born. This race suicide among our better classes is a great problem of our savants. We all know the rate of reproduction among the negroes and the foreign element. Why then should not people of privilege subject themselves to a little inconvenience for the sake of their nation? Mussolini is compelling his people to pay attention to this.

Heredity and environment play great parts in the background of every child. The blood that courses through their veins determines to a large extent the character they shall possess, and the environment to which they are subjected largely determines their course in life. Shakespeare's princess, though abandoned in her infancy upon a mountain, and found by a shepherd in whose crude home she was reared, yet was a princess in all of her actions and thoughts.

There are certain laws laid down in the Bible about a child. Against these laws, we have some modern psychological theories that try to strip them of their efficacy. God says first of all that we should, "withhold not corrections from the child for if thou beatest him with a rod he shall not die." But no, psychology says that we ought not by any means use corporal punishment, and



so we have cast aside the Scripture and we humor the child. Personally, I do not feel that bodily punishment is a good correction to be continually administered, but with John Locke, I think it should be given in cases of obstinacy. Pleasure and pain ought not to control our actions, but a sense of approval or disapproval. If a family manifests its disapproval of a child's actions and its approval of worthy actions, this in conjunction with pleasure and pain, or rewards and punishments, will have a far greater effect for it will teach the child the value of action. The promise to parents is, "Train up the child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart therefrom."

But the other side of the question, that of the attitude of the children toward parents, is very important. The first duty of a child is obedience, and this obedience should be in all matters. The question arises as to whether a man ought to obey his parents if his parents militate against what he considers to be Christian Truth. The law concerning this in the Bible is that we ought always to obey God rather than man, even if that man happens to be our own father. Our obedience to him is not based upon his superiority to us, but is based upon the authority committed unto him by God. If he fulfills the demands of that authority in governing his life with Christian Truth, it is our duty to obey him.

Just as the parents are pushing their children off in schools, so children are getting rid of the old folks by means of institutions. Some young people feel that they have no obligations to their parents. In fact, a quite prevalent opinion is that inasmuch as they had nothing to say about their coming into the world, they owe nothing to their parents. Their parents should not have had them unless they wanted them. This is the same sin which Jesus denounces in the fifteenth chapter of Matthew. Anyone who said "corbin" to his father or his mother, that is, "it is a gift by whatsoever thou mightest profit by me," was guilty of the breaking of this commandment.

In Leviticus, youth was commanded to stand in the presence of hoar heads, and Proverbs claims that the hoar head is the crown of glory. A sign of the last times will be universal disobedience and irreverence of children.

## 2. Authority in Society

Just as authority in the home is committed by God to the father, so the authority of society is committed to government. Paul, in Romans 13, like 2 Peter 2, clearly states this. It is true that in a democracy, the people invest their rulers with authority, and yet this is done in the Providence of God, and the civil magistrates are ordained of God and represent God. Resistance to them is resistance to God, and obedience to them must be rendered as a matter of conscience as a part of our obedience to God. If we choose to disobey, it is a matter of our judgment, but like the martyrs and the apostles, we must also abide by the consequences. Disobedience is not resistance. If any man is to learn to obey society he must first learn the authority in his own home.

The reasons assigned by psychologists to most of the social delinquents are two primary fallacies on the part of parents: first, the idea that children are too young to be corrected, whereas the younger you correct them, the better. For

there will come a time when the rod shall be of no avail, and if great principles are not instilled within the will and mind before that time, it is too late. Secondly, the principle of approval for the act. If the act is approved, it will be repeated. If it is repeated, it will make a habit, and if it becomes a habit, the individual will become incorrigible. Therefore, the atmosphere of disapproval is one of the greatest means of child training.

When youth no longer knows the meaning of authority, youth shall take the reins into his own hands. This is the condition existing in this country today. Every student of crime knows that the age of the criminal filling our prisons has lowered until it is now under twenty-four years of age. Andrew Park, prosecuting attorney of Pittsburgh, distinctly states that the average age of the criminal coming before him is that of the late teens or early twenties. The same happens concerning physical dissipation. When the counsel and authority of our elders is cast aside, the physical life of the nation will deteriorate. The seeds of sin that we sow today will blossom and bear fruit in the next generation.

## 3. Authority in Religion

Just as the children who do not learn obedience to authority in the home, do not obey the laws of the state, so also, the same children will not obey authority in religion. Sin consists in flouting authority, in self-assertiveness, in the drive of self, or in the substitution of self for God. If the little child is allowed to substitute himself in the home for the parent as the ruler of the house without correction, we may look for that child to follow his own will rather than the law of society, and later on, to completely substitute himself for God. The importance then of training a child as he ought to be trained is not only revealed in the Scriptures but is manifest to reason.

The earlier a child is brought under authority, the better. It says that they brought little children unto Jesus that He might bless them, and He said, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven." Implied in this is a command and obligation upon all parents to bring their children into a saving knowledge and relationship with Jesus Christ. Once this is experienced, the child will learn the real authority of life, that of obedience and pursuance of the will and ideal of Christ.

Build then strong and sure  
With firm and ample base  
And ascending and secure  
Will tomorrow take its place.

Build a family altar, where in the sacred sanctum of the home the child is taught the things of God and brought into a knowledge of God. Build then the conception of authority; first, for the parents, and if necessary by correction that we might know that if we disobey God's authority, there shall be a punishment awaiting us; then for religious and civil authority.

## QUESTIONS

1. What is the difference between matriarchal and patriarchal forms of government? What does the Bible teach on the subject? Is the absolute authority of Abraham in his control over Isaac to be exercised by fathers today?

2. What does modern psychology teach about training children? What are dangers concerned with the parent child relationship?

3. Do you know of any illustrations of social delinquents due to a lack of home training? Contrast these

with the product of Puritan training in New England—Whittier, Longfellow, Ethan Allen, Jonathan Edwards, etc.

## Topic for May 15

### Forgetting God

Scripture—Exodus 20:13.

**I**N 1914, the world forgot God, and in its forgetting of God it ceased to remember the dignity of man. Man was created in the image of God, and he bears the consciousness of that image deep in his bosom even when other things seem to blot it out. That image implies freedom, infinite possibilities for righteousness or for evil, the sense of moral righteousness, restlessness while in sin, and the ever upward groping towards something which is God though he knows it not. This is quite different from the idea so often spoken of that man has a spark of divinity within him. There is no deity in man, but man was created in the image of God, and shall never be content until he finds a supplement of his nature which is Christ.

There is a limitation to the law against taking life. It does not mean that man should not take any kind of life, for the Scripture in other places expressly states that man should kill and eat. If animals, then, exist for the physical sustenance of man then also it is perfectly legitimate to use them for the purposes of medical vivisection and experimentation. This does not make room, however, for cruelty of animals under any form, and this Commandment may well be taken as the basis of a society for the prevention of cruelty of animals.

#### 1. Violation of the Commandment with Reference to Oneself

Within the last few years a wave of student suicides and also of financial suicides has swept this country. We cannot help but wonder why there were not more. When the student's mind has lost its faith in the eternal things of God and of the dignity of man by considering itself a mere speck without qualitative difference in an immense universe, it is but a short step to the taking of such an insignificant thing as one's life. If, however, a man conceives of himself as qualitatively distinct from all other things in the universe, though he may be quantitatively small, yet he has a relatively great importance. Even though he realizes that he is a sinner yet he is conscious of the fact that the image of God has not completely been effaced. And hence he still respects himself. He is kept humble by the fact of his sin and he is kept worthy by the fact of his dignity. This makes suicide a crime, for a man robs God of his possession. He did not create himself nor the universe, and he is attempting flight from the situation in which God has placed him. Suicide is cowardly fleeing from difficulty.

Socrates and Kant said we had no right to claim this escape, even though their reasons were different. Socrates said that it was the desertion of the post where the gods have placed us. Kant said that it is a logical fallacy and self-contradictory to have the maxim of self-preservation and self-destruction. But the Bible says that suicide is wrong because it is the destruction of something that does not belong to the individual. Saul committed suicide when he found that he was to fall into the hands of the Philistines. Rather than be so disgraced he fell upon his sword. In the

New Testament we read of the suicide of Judas Iscariot. Both were unbelievers and would come under the same class as most of our suicides today.

And yet every so often a Christian Church or family is perturbed by the suicide of a professing Christian. Christianity makes no excuse for any individual to seek escape from any toilsome and weary situation of life, for such is often the means of God for the training of the spirit. The greater way is always to seek the grace of God to sustain one in such circumstances. Hence we can say that a Christian will not commit suicide. But this statement must be qualified by the condition of sanity. If a man becomes temporarily insane through a mental complex, he may commit suicide and still not be responsible for it.

#### 2. Violation of the Commandment with Reference to One's Neighbor

How close murder is connected with even the best regulated families is manifested by the fact that the first child born into the world was a murderer and the second child was the victim. It is also brought home to us by the fact that every man is a murderer before he even commits murder. This is clearly taught by Paul in Romans 3, and by Jesus when He said, that the man who was angry with his brother has committed murder already. The first law ever instituted for the human race was that of capital punishment for murder. After the flood, God instituted human government, and laid down the law that, "whoso sheddeth man's blood by man shall his blood be shed, for in the image of God made He man."

Murder sometimes exists in veiled forms. It is not always as open as the Chicago and Pittsburgh gang wars. It is not always done by the direct hand of poison, or the knife, or the gun. We remember that David wanted to rid himself of Uriah, one of his noble soldiers because of a guilty passion that David had indulged with Uriah's wife, Bathsheba. He did not kill him outright, but he gave a letter to Joab, the captain of his host, to put Uriah in front of the hottest battle where he might be killed. David was held accountable by God. Industrialists and men of great parts have often desired certain ends for themselves, and in the attaining of them have allowed men to sacrifice their lives. Whether it be child labor, or tenement buildings, or houses of vice, or poorly ventilated mills, that sap the life of the victims, yet God will hold the instigator responsible.

There is also a positive implication of this Commandment. If one is not to hate, what is he to do? Well, obviously to love. That love should be threefold. First, to self, as a creation in the image of God, and hence to obtain the greatest development of one's possibilities for God. The second love is the love of neighbors, which includes all men. The last object to be loved consists of the Christian brethren, who are our brothers in every sense of the word, and our love for them should be an eternal love. Paul said, "Do good unto the household of faith," meaning that we should do good unto them above all others. And John said, "We know that we are born of God because we love the brethren."

#### 3. Violation of this Commandment with Reference to Society

Another use made of this Commandment is the utter condemnation of war. We have a con-



stantly enlarging group in the United States that is declaiming war as an instrument of national policy. With their program is included a policy of condemning ministers who do not actively participate in their attempts to outlaw war. In large conventions of youth I have been personally asked to promise to never bear arms, and have seen others make the promise. Such an attitude to my way of thinking, and according to the Scripture, is unwarranted. We grant that the majority of wars have not only been unjustifiable but have brought terrible misery and suffering upon the world, all because of the economic greed of capitalists within certain nations. However, we cannot help but believe that some wars are justifiable; one such being our own Civil War.

Christians ought to exercise every means available to limit the number of wars and to settle disputes by other means. And the basic fact remains that as long as men will quarrel one with another just so long nations will quarrel one with another. Unless an adequate world police force could be instituted to keep order and to insure protection of property, dreams of peace are merely dreams. For sin is in the human heart, and sin causes conflict. Until we can be convinced that there was not a worse thing than war, it is necessary to endorse war. There are times when non-resistance would be self-destructive. The teaching of Jesus about non-resistance was given as the ethical law for Christian society, but it is very manifest that society is not Christian, and hence, Christian laws and principles are not sufficient for it. As long as it is justifiable to kill a tiger or a rattlesnake that attacks a human individual, so long it is justifiable to kill a man in self-defense.

The words of Jesus upon this subject have often been quoted on both sides of the question of war. And yet it is well to remember that His prophecy was that there shall be wars and rumors of wars until the end of the age. It is also well to remember that the Kingdom of God is not promised to come on earth until Jesus Christ comes again, and until the Kingdom of Heaven comes on earth we cannot expect our swords to be beaten into plowshares or pruning hooks no more than we expect the lion to lie down with the lamb.

Peace and harmony of personal life can only come when man has settled the conflict of sin in himself when the war is over between him and God. Peace with his neighbor shall be obtained when he is able to love his neighbor as himself. And international peace can exist only through the Christianizing of the nations. This exists partially now through the work of Christ, but will be complete when redemption is complete and this age is concluded.

#### QUESTIONS

1. Could the killing of the finer senses of the personality through indulgence, and careless living be termed murder? What about killing one's conscience?

2. If Abraham had killed Isaac in fulfillment of the Divine command would it have been murder? Are human sacrifices ever demanded by God? Theoretically a Confucian has the power of life and death over his children. Is this a good system?

3. What does Jesus mean when He says that the man who is angry with his brother has committed murder? Remember that this statement was qualified by the words "without cause" (Matt. 5:21ff).

## Topic for May 22

### What are We —Brutes?

Scripture—Exodus 20:14, Matthew 5:30, I Samuel 12.

ANY thoroughly Christian character has a reticence to enter a public discussion upon the seventh Commandment, and yet it is necessary that it be done. The Bible is full of statements about it because life teems with facts about it. What the Bible does not hesitate to speak about, the Christian minister also should not hesitate to preach upon.

That this is a subject that needs unequivocally to be spoken upon by the Christian pulpit is manifested by the amount of un-Christian literature that is being spread abroad to form the opinions and ideals of our nation. From unwarranted statements by a representative group of men from the Protestant Churches down to the loose and immoral literature circulated in other ways than by the mails this undermining process is going on. Just a short time ago in the Unitarian Minister's Association at Philadelphia, a member urged that the single standard of sex be discarded and that extra marital relation be countenanced if happiness of households depend upon them. This Reverend Daniel Sands of Quincy, Illinois, said,

There is no reason why married people should be forced to lead an isolated existence. But they are forced by a silly social standard and by gossip in and out of the Church. They are robbed of happy normal contacts. . . . It is perfectly silly to think that two persons are made for each other and don't need anyone else.

This minister advocated this proposition because he believes that there is no standard of morality. He has rejected the deity of Christ, the personality of the Spirit, the infallibility of the Scriptures, and now we find this is the logical result of his thinking. There are certain things that must be said upon this subject:

#### 1. What is It?—The Definition

Adultery exists in three forms. The first, is the sin committed as an overt act by the unmarried. This is what has been termed a changing conception by some. Just two years ago, a lecturer in a certain Y. W. C. A., according to the newspaper reports, endorsed pre-marital sex relations. But the Scripture is very clear that this is a transgression of the law of God. All we need to do is to bear in mind the defilement of Dinah, the daughter of Jacob, by one of the sons of Shechem. It was termed folly in Israel, and by the consent of all the sons of Jacob it deserved death. There are numerous other illustrations that such relationships were sin in the eyes of God. That has not changed up to this day. We might also add that any of the loose relationships of youth that throw them in the way of temptation to this sin are also sin. What is known as the modern petting made possible through the automobile and now even intruding into the best regulated social events is an unnatural relationship, and in that it works havoc with the emotion and leads to deeper consequences in sin. I wish that even Christian young people would pay attention to that fact.

The second form of adultery is that committed by people who are married. No doubt, this is one of the prevalent causes for our numerous divorces today. Our papers are full of the stories of Reno divorces and remarriages. Now Jesus said that

divorce was permissible upon one ground only, and that if one is divorced and remarried upon any other ground, he commits adultery. That is why almost universally, throughout the Protestant Church, Christian ministers refuse to marry divorced persons. Paul adds another ground for divorce, that of permanent desertion on the part of one of the parties. Many are the people who today will have to answer before the throne of God concerning their willful breaking of His law.

The third violation of this Commandment deals with the sin of the mind. Jesus said, "If any man looketh on a woman to lust after her he has committed adultery with her already in his heart." The reason of this is that out of the heart proceedeth all unrighteousness, iniquity, and adultery. As a man thinks so he is, whether he commits the overt act or not. We have all read the story in our grammars of the king's falcon, who having seen a poisonous snake in an upper pool of a spring, continually knocked the cup from its master's hand as he was about to drink until finally he drew his sword and killed the faithful falcon. Then climbing upon the rocks to that very pool he stooped upon his knees to drink the water when he saw the snake. Stepping back in horror, a sincere grief gripped him for the falcon that had saved his life. Would God that every young man and every young woman had a falcon to guard his mind and thoughts lest he drink of the poison of modern sex ideas that would kill his soul.

## 2. What it Does—Degradation

The violation of this Commandment in any of its three forms produces a terrible hardness of heart and life. It is said by medical men that they can pick out from a multitude those individuals who are habitually thinking impure thoughts. If it so affects the expression on one's face, how must it affect the sensibilities of his nature? He loses that wonderful sense of the high regard for the opposite sex, and for the beauty of the normal relationships of life. He ruins his physical nature, even if the punishments of disease do not come upon him. He cannot escape the psychological and the spiritual results though he may for a time escape the biological.

A low attitude upon this will disintegrate the family. This has been proved in Russia where there are over four million babies in government institutions. Unless the family is safeguarded, the unit of God's dealing with men is removed. And the most sacred institution since the creation is broken up. Plato tried to do it with the philosophy of society but failed. Russia is attempting it today, and individuals have attempted it throughout the years. This was the one sin of David to which we may attribute the social unrest and rebellion that came during his reign. This was the sin of Samson which brought him low at the feet of the enemies of the commonwealth of God.

This is the sin of America today. Our worst sin is not murder, nor thievery, nor selfishness, but it is this sin. It is like a cancer that is eating at the vitals of our nation. It is throwing into the life blood of our people a weakness that will bear fruit in a day when we least expect it. Through disease, through weakening of physical stamina, through the destruction of moral fibre, by this sin our nation is preparing itself for a fall.

## 3. Where it Ends One—Damnation

Dwight L. Moody said that adultery is the quickest road to hell. But before one ever gets to hell punishments begin to take place. David learned this. In punishment for his sin with Bathsheba the sword never departed from his house.

It also brings one to the place where he has no natural affection which God says will be that of the condition of the world just preceding the judgment. They shall be "without natural affection." And sometimes as we look about us and see the lack of love of children for parents and parents for children we wonder if we are not approaching that time.

In the Book of Revelation we are told that all adulterers shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone which is the second death. They shall not inherit the Kingdom of God. The adulterer may say that he does not believe in hell, but neither does a thief believe in property rights. But to him hell shall become one awful reality when he is under the condemnation of God. To manifest the antipathy of this sin to spirituality God compared it to the world, which in the Book of Revelation is called the great Harlot prepared for judgment. In contrast to this, the Christians make up the bride of Christ who is dressed in pure white raiment, symbolizing the purity of her life.

Would God that we had more Vashties who would say, "I will not obey the king." Would that we had more Josephs who would say, "God forbid that I should do this sin against God and my master." Would that we had more Nathans to level their fingers at guilty Davids to bring them to their senses in confession and repentance.

## QUESTIONS

1. What will God's attitude be toward watchmen who failed to warn the people concerning this sin and its consequences? (See Ezekiel 33).
2. Can you notice a looseness in thinking and in acting in this realm in the last few years? To what is it due?
3. The Genesis record implies that God created the sexes as compliments of each other, that the union should be monogamous, and representative of His relationship to the church. What do you think of this?
4. Was marriage evolved or was it instituted for man?

## Topic for May 29

### Do Men Have Rights ?

#### Property

Scripture—Exodus 20:15.

JESUS said, "The poor you have with you always." But when we behold the situation of hundreds of thousands of people, we begin to wonder about the possession of property.

The purpose of this Commandment is to defend personal possession of property and promote respect for the possession of property by others. And wherever property exists, there is a need for an explanation of this Commandment. A standing witness to the need of teaching and preaching upon the eighth Commandment is the existence of locks upon our doors, prisons in our states and cities, police upon our streets, and fear in our hearts. Jesus said that the thief does not break in where the strong man is guarding his house, but if the



strong man is bound then the thief taketh whatsoever he wishes. Yes, stealing is a fact of life.

### 1. It is Right to Have Property

There are three main divisions in thinking concerning property. The first is called "communism." One of the first extant treatises upon this subject is that of Plato in the Republic. The ideal thing for the state in his estimation was the common possession of property by the state. But Plato's utopia was never put in practice because it took no account of the depravity of the human heart. Another notable exponent of "communism" was Karl Marx, who has had great influence in Europe and Russia. The communism of this type, however, was in the interest of the laboring man. But it too has fallen by the wayside. A more modern teaching on communism is that by Lenin of Russia. It has many of the same marks as Plato's communism, but is more definitely anti-theistic or atheistic. To be a member of such a communistic group one's belief in God must be in the process of disintegration. If the reports are true that we get in this country concerning Russia, we find that instead of elevating the people it is greatly degenerating them.

Some advocates of communism harken back to the Christian communistic practice of the Early Church. We grant that in all probability there was a communism, but it was not what many think it was. First, it was not a compulsory communism. This is proved by the coming of Ananias to Peter with only part of the price of his land. Peter said to him, "Was it not thine own . . . Why then didst thou lie?" The sin of Ananias was not the sin of being out of harmony of communistic ideals, but was the sin of dissembling. Secondly, the Christian community was probably the result of an intense enthusiasm created by the first reception of the Gospel, and by the expectant return of Christ before the completion of God's revelation. The Christians erred in their practice in this matter, and the practice was discontinued as the Scripture clearly shows. Thirdly, it is possible that the community was not communistic but that each man considered his possessions as the possessions of the whole group to be used if there was need.

The opposite theory to communism is capitalism. This was advanced especially by the Christian Puritans, who believed that wealth could be gained and used for the greater glory of God. There are some distinct values to this teaching, which are a complete refutation of communism. The first is that personal possession is a stimulus to production. If man did produce but had no right of possession, his production would be spoiled or confiscated by others who would not work. Another consideration is that indolence and idleness is a far worse influence upon society and upon the individual than is over taxation in physical work. Personal possession is also a motive to intellectual aggression. The man who can possess a patent has an incentive for his inventive genius. The man who can possess a garden has an incentive to design that garden for beauty, and likewise, in all phases of life.

Nevertheless, vice has also attended capitalism. With it have come huge fortunes, which have centered the power of the country into the hands of

a few men, who are able at will to plunge us into war or into economic chaos. With capitalism is connected the exploitations of the masses, lowering them to mere puppets, to do the will of someone else. This reached its zenith in slavery, when one man considered himself the possessor of another who was created his equal. Capitalism breeds selfishness, a desire for luxury and self-indulgence, covetousness, strife, class hatred, and dishonest practices. A glance at sweatshops, at child labor, and other abuses, cause us to question the superiority of capitalism.

A third theory upon the question of property is that of the Christian. This, whether in the Old Testament or the New, might be described by saying that everything is God's (Ps. 24). In Leviticus 25 we read about the law of the land, which law was that every seventh year should be a year of the Sabbath, and upon that year the land should have rest from cultivation. Every forty-ninth year was the year of jubilee, at which time all of the land which has been sold during the forty-nine years preceding reverted to the family to which it was originally assigned by the representatives of God. God says that "The land is mine, for ye are strangers and sojourners with me." To manifest this, a tenth of all the produce of the land was given to God. This shows that the land was really God's and He allowed them the use of it, and the first fruits of it must be returned unto Him. On the one hand, the year of jubilee guarded against the amassing of great estates and of great fortunes, and on the other hand, the tithe and the unrequited corners of the field, and the produce of the Sabbath year guarded against degrading poverty.

The New Testament tells us that all that we possess is God's, and that man is a steward of that which God has given unto him, which is to be used in God's work. Jesus never condemns riches for themselves, but He does condemn the wrong use of riches. Dives was not sent to hell because he was a rich man, but because he refused to harken unto the prophets, and because he did not use his riches for the glory of God. The fool, possessing his bursting barns, was not a fool in business, but he was a fool because he put his trust in riches that were laid up where moth and rust do corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal. It was no wonder that Jesus proclaimed that it was easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of God. Most rich men paid no attention to the Kingdom of God. Nevertheless, Jesus did not forget to state that even some rich men possessed the grace of God, given in spite of their interest in life.

### 2. Does Might Make Right?

In theory, throughout the history of thought, the thesis that might makes right has often been advanced. In Socrates' dialogue with Thrasymachus he riddled the argument for the right of the stronger to rule. And yet that argument has been advanced by a number of thinkers throughout history. Nietzsche advanced the central conception of his philosophy that might makes right. In this, Nietzsche justified most of the sins of man.

The philosophy of might has been given wide acceptance through the teaching of evolution. However this may be camouflaged in Darwinian, Spen-

cerian, or modern terms, the basis of it still remains as the survival of fittest, whether it be in the realm of biology, of economics, or of intellect. Some wonder why a theory of evolution has produced such terrible controversy in the church. Men may argue about other theories, political or economic, and they never cause a ripple, but upon the question of evolution depends the questions of sin. If sin is the result of brute force within us, we are not responsible for it, and the man who can get away with the most is the man who overcomes and survives.

As opposed to this, we see Jacob condemned for stealing the birthright of his brother Esau. We find Potiphar's wife condemned for the stealing of Joseph's good name, in reading which, it is well to remember that a good name is worth more than almost any other possession. We find the sluggard guilty for the stealing of time, and David displeasing God for stealing virtue. For the Christian might never makes right.

### 3. Do Christians Have any Rights?

Theoretically, the Christian has no rights in the common meaning of that term. He is no longer living on merit, but on grace. Consequently he can demand nothing, but he receives everything. He owns land for all is God's, and everything is given unto him for he is an heir of God and a joint heir of Christ. Practically, this should be followed out as literally as possible. A Christian should not go to court with another Christian. It is better, Paul says, to suffer wrong than to defile God's name before unbelievers. The reason for this is that the Sermon on the Mount should be the law of the Christian community. That it cannot be fulfilled toward unbelievers is manifest because it would be a self-destructive process, and the believer would find himself stripped of the necessities of life. Even as Christ has borne our punishment, and as we are connected with Him through the redemptive principles for our Salvation, so also, vengeance belongeth to the Lord, and we should literally allow Him to bring to pass His punishments. In this connection we know that Jesus had no rights. He came not to do His will, but to do the Will of His Father.

In another sense of the word "right" there are certain rights of Christians. They have the right to expect fellow Christians to be honest, honest in their profession of religion, honest in their relation of Christian experience, and honest in their dealings with their fellow men. They have the right to expect that any fellow Christian who has done wrong will make restitution. And they have the right to expect the servants of God to tithe, to pray, and to do the positive acts of a Christian life. To provide a remedy for the violation of this Commandment, modernism is helpless. It can only give a precept unto individuals. It can never change their actions. At this point, social service and ethical education fail. There is a need of a transforming process which only the preaching of the vital redemptive religion of Jesus is able to bring.

#### QUESTIONS

1. What are some theories about possession of property? Which is Christian?

2. Should poverty be practiced by the Christian? What about the example of the rich young ruler and of St. Francis of Assisi?

3. What do you think of the Puritan economies that mix religion and possession of property? Do not criticize unless you have something better.

## Topic for June 5

### Can a Man Deceive God?

#### Justice

Scripture—Exodus 20:16. Acts 5:1-15.

THERE is a story told about Dr. McCosh, once president of the Princeton University. He was out calling on some sick students. Winding his way up the dormitory stairs, he knocked upon the door of the student's room. A voice from within cried, "Who's there?" Dr. McCosh replied, "It's me." "Who's me?" said the student. The president answered, "Dr. McCosh." "You're a liar," said the student. "If it were Dr. McCosh, he would have said, 'It is I.'"

We hear of a good many kinds of lies and of liars today. We have white lies and black lies, and lies of every color of the rainbow. There are lies made in business, lies to the sick, lies in jest, and lies with malicious intent. Thomas Aquinas, the great theologian of the Middle Ages, said that lies were of three classes—the pernicious, the benevolent, and the jocose. But the Scripture includes them all in the same class. With God, a lie is a lie, and the Bible says all liars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone.

#### 1. False Witness or a Good Name

The primary thing struck at by this Commandment is the practice of false witness. False witnessing primarily takes place in the court of justice. In order to guard against this in the Old Testament times, a false witness was done to as he accused the innocent victim. It was the case of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. This was a hard penalty but it preserved the attitude of truth among those people. The sin of false witnessing at court is the sin of lying to God. Governments are instituted of God, even though the power may be delegated by a democratic means. When an individual witnesses in court, he is witnessing unto God, and the man who makes a false witness jeopardizes the institution of society.

But no less true is the wrong representation of the fact of life before any man a false witness. Some hold, and I think rightly, that the court of public opinion is a divine court, and that when a man causes a mistaken judgment to be given by the jury of the court of public opinion which is the public by any false witness of his, he is violating this Commandment of God. Shakespeare said, Who steals my purse steals trash; 'tis something nothing; 'Twas mine, 'tis his, and has been slave to thousands; But he that filches from me my good name Robs me of that which not enriches him, And makes me poor indeed.

In a day of controversy, such as that in which we live, men ought zealously to guard against misrepresenting their opponents. It is a comparatively easy thing to take a portion of what a man believes, construct about it a system, and then attack the system or attack the man as though he held this system. This is done to a great degree in politics, and hardly to a less degree in the field of religion. Surely, a man who is defending Christian truth ought to be honest in his dealing with his opponent's position.

As soon as a man bears false witness, either before a court or before the opinion of men, something in him dies. It is like the case of Ananias



who came to Peter and professed to give all that he had that he might get a reputation such as that possessed by Barnabas, whereas in reality, he kept back part of the price. When Peter asked him if he had sold the land for this much, and he said, "Yes," he was struck dead by God. Many are the men in whom God has struck something dead at the moment of their bearing false witness. The judgment begins immediately upon a man who lies. Under this category should come those who are hypocrites in religion, that is, those who profess to be Christian, but are living a lie. When we read the scorching denunciations of Jesus to the Pharisees, when He called them whitened sepulchres and a generation of vipers, we realize that there was no hope for them. They were dead to the Truth. Outwardly, they put on a semblance of religion, but inwardly, they were full of dead men's bones.

## 2. Idle Words or an Unbridled Tongue

James tells us that we offend in many things, but the worse offense of all is a word offense. It is like a fire that is very small but in a wind may be whipped to a mighty conflagration. It was only the kicking of an oil lamp by a cow that started the Chicago fire, and it is only the dropping of an idle word by some wag that starts many a fire of passion that ends in destruction. The tongue is but a little member of the body, and yet it is as a bit for a horse for as it goes so goes the whole body. It is as the rudder that turns the ship in the current and moves it against its will. James calls it a deadly poison, an unruly evil, an untamed animal, and a fountain that sends forth bitter or sweet water. The man who can control his tongue is the man who is perfect.

Someday each one of us shall know the amount of sorrow, destruction, and devastation that have been caused by our idle words. No one would limit a lively imagination either for the purpose of literature or for personal repartee. But anyone who continually indulges in such finds his sense of truth will begin to lose its edge. Many are the people that are given to exaggeration, and who, if they would but check upon themselves, would be greatly surprised. In order to make themselves masters of conversation and interest, they have lost their sense of veracity. Others, through idle gossip, deal in personalities until they have stripped someone of his character. After all, a man's character is what he is alone, but his reputation is what people think about him. And the idea is to have one's character and one's reputation correspond. How easy it is then to steal from someone the reputation upon which so much depends.

When Jesus preached His tongue religion, it was based upon the statement, "Let your communications be yea, yea, and nay, nay, for whatsoever is more than these cometh from evil." The use that we make of the tongue is quite contrary to this. In order to emphasize our thought, instead of using interrogative, indicative or explanatory statements, many use oaths, by-words, and additional stock phrases, which subtract from rather than add to the truth of their statement. As soon as someone has to back up his statement with the authority of a by-word, one immediately thinks that his witness is false. (Read the sermon on the mount for the use of the tongue.)

## 3. Truth or the Eternal Standard

God is the Truth. There is no truth higher than

God. It has been our contention throughout this entire study of the Commandments that they amplified the law laid down in the garden, which was the covenant of works. This covenant of works revealed the ethical nature of God who is the Truth. From this Truth, man has fallen, and has followed Satan, who was a liar from the beginning, and who is the negation of the nature of God. This is taught by Jesus, when He told the Jews that Satan was a liar and the father of it, and that when they lied they spoke of the things of Satan. Hence, all men who are not related to God, the Father, through the New Birth, are of their father, the devil, who was the liar from the beginning.

This Commandment condemns men in showing that they have not fulfilled the ethical demands of the nature of God, and that there is no hope for them whether they have consciously been liars or not, outside of the redemption that is in Christ. Jesus told these Jews that if they would continue in His word then they would be His disciples indeed, for they would know the Truth, and the Truth would make them free. This also is the obligation of the Christian. He must know the Truth, which Truth is God. And this Truth was set forth by Christ personally, and by the Word which told about Christ. Hence, we have here the source of Truth. In order to know the Truth, the Christian must place himself under the preaching of the Truth or of the Word of God and of Christ. Many are the preachers today who are not preaching this. And any Christian who continues to endorse his work is joining in his false witness.

Due to pressure that is being brought to bear upon ministers today, they have allowed the Word of God to slip from them and have become false witnesses. Some of these false witnesses might be mentioned. One is the modernist, who stands in the pulpit and preaches that Jesus is the Son of God only as we all are, and that there are many mistakes in the Scripture, and that man is saved by his character, rather than by the atonement of Christ. John, the apostle, said, "Whosoever denieth that Jesus is the Christ is a liar," that is, a false witness. Another group of false witnesses are those who profess contrary to experience that there is no such a thing as pain, that sin does not exist, and that sickness is only an illusion. They teach this contrary to the teaching of Jesus and to the Word of God. They are false witnesses deluding people.

A false witness may be able to lie to or about his neighbor, but he cannot deceive God. God knoweth the thoughts and the intents of the heart, and He knows what is said in the integrity of one's being. Though our actions may be misconstrued by men we know that they are not by God, and though our reputation may be ruined by men, we know that God knows what we are.

## QUESTIONS

1. Look through a concordance and find all that the Bible says about liars. What is a lie? Is a general's strategy a lie? Should you tell the truth in every circumstance? Is a lie ever justifiable?

2. What rumors started may be classified as lying? What reference does this have to a good name? Has the church ever perpetrated frauds on people? Are there sects today who teach lies?

3. What should be our use of the tongue? Prove your statement from the Bible.

# The Library Table

CONDUCTED BY PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, M.A., D.D.

## An Astronomer's Religion

OUR review of the book entitled, *Has Science Discovered God?* in last month's issue of this journal grew to such length that we could not take the space to analyze the essays of all the contributors to that volume. The present article will be devoted to Professor Harlan T. Stetson's chapter entitled "Religion in a World Remade by Science."

Professor Stetson is the head of the department of astronomy at Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, which was founded by the Methodist Episcopal Church. At the start it is pertinent to say that Dr. Stetson's negative views regarding religion would undermine the very foundations of Methodism, and of Christianity itself, and would put a poor, flabby and indeterminate substitute in their stead. Just why such a teacher should be employed in a Christian college it is difficult to say. But let us make good our criticism by examining his article.

The whole essay gives the impression that Dr. Stetson is far more interested in belittling and deriding Biblical faith than he is in discovering God by his scientific apparatus. We are trying to avoid epithets; yet we are moved to say that Dr. Stetson's article is a direct assault on evangelical Christianity and the teaching of the Bible. Moreover, in many places he caricatures and misconstrues the evangelical view. He is ungenerous toward people with whom he differs. His modes of expression indicate a hectic spirit rather than a judicial mind. Let us note a number of his expressions.

He wonders if, "like the poor, the fundamentalists are always with us," and says he has grave doubts "whether or not we can do them any good." Some folks, he says, "have no desire or perhaps capacity to exert themselves mentally," because of their "adherence to an ecclesiastical regime." Is that a slam at the Methodist Church? If not, whom does it mean? These "ecclesiastical regimes" are "designed to win the approval of a benevolent Being, on the one hand, or to appease

malevolent spirits, on the other." He speaks of the "anthropomorphic Elohim of Genesis" and the "tribal King Yahweh." He scoffs at "the uninformed fundamentalist." He accuses evangelical Christians of believing the Bible to contain "stenographic accounts of the doings of the Almighty sprung full grown like Minerva from the head of Zeus." "Blind tradition harassed by the continuous fear that doubt could damn his soul," is another of his reflections. He speaks of "the religious zealot of yesterday," which is clearly aimed at people who accept Biblical Christianity. He questions why one must "have continually inflicted on his intelligence the recital of the creed to which he can make no intellectual assent." Of course, he refers to the Apostles' Creed, which is frequently used in Methodist services. He also finds fault with "a hymnology based on the cosmology of Dante and the theology of the Middle Ages"; it "is not in keeping with progressive thought and can bring little intellectual satisfaction to the reader of scientific literature."

From these citations it will be seen that our author not only shows the disdainful spirit, but is also afflicted with the superiority complex. His predilection for caricaturing the Biblical doctrines sometimes borders on irreverence. We give a sample of his labored and involved style, as well as of his cavalier treatment of Biblical doctrine:

The sense of an enlarged God to keep pace with the expanding universe of astronomy has undoubtedly proved somewhat disconcerting to the individualized conception of Deity made popular through the evangelical tradition of the church which for generations has emphasized the individual relationship with a Heavenly Father whose solicitation for the human soul was consummated in the doctrine of the atonement. [What does the reader think of an unpunctuated sentence like this?] . . . Entertaining the question of the existence of life on other planets and in other systems of the universe than our own makes any adherence to a restricted philosophy of atonement quite untenable.

Dr. Stetson does not want to be considered irreligious, however. So he uses some



sharp speech against those who advocate "the materialistic conception" of the universe. He thinks modern science has led "towards a spiritual view of the universe not possible in the days of the atomic theory." Just how the replacing of "the conception of the electron as corpuscles" by the idea of "a series of vibrations in a hypothetical ether," can lead to an "appreciation of spiritual realities," is difficult to see: it certainly is a very tenuous idea.

Indeed, Dr. Stetson's kind of religion is much like an *ignis fatuus*. Take his doctrine of God—what it is, is a difficult problem, a Sphinx's riddle. Is he a personal being? Can men hold communion with him? Will he answer prayer? Does he care for His creatures? Will he pardon our sins if we repent and ask him? Has he been willing to make any sacrifice to help people out of their sins and bring them to salvation? Has he prepared an eternal abode for people who long for an immortal life? To all these questions the Biblical teaching gives a clear and unequivocal reply. But Dr. Stetson does not even mention them. His god is a nebulous kind of a being. He banks much on science; and thinks it must reconstruct religion, but his kind of science has certainly not discovered a God who is worth while or whom one would think of loving and trusting.

He cannot abide the Biblical account of the creation of the universe. He satirizes the idea of man "occupying the center of interest." Man was "the chief concern of creation," according to the Bible. "All else was incidental," he shouts. "Hence, in the story of creation in Genesis how casual is the reference, 'the stars also.'" This shows his attitude toward the Bible (which, by the way, the Methodist Church confessionally accepts as the inspired Word of God). But how would *he* tell the story of creation? Here it is in his own prolix language; see whether it is adequate and rational:

If an astronomer were rewriting the account [of creation], it might read somewhat as follows: From the beginning there have been great stellar universes each so vast that light traveling at the incredible speed of 186,000 miles per second takes hundreds of thousands of years to cross it. The universes stream through space at distances so remote from one another that light takes not thousands but millions of years to pass from one to the other, so that no matter where in such a cosmic scheme one may regard himself he can never learn the true nature of things at any one time.

We have copied our author's statement *verbatim et punctuatim*. With such lack of

the use of punctuation-marks, is it any wonder that Dr. Stetson's matter makes "hard reading"? But is his account of creation deep and fundamental? Does it account for the existence of anything? Whence came all the material of this vast whirling cosmos? Why, he does not go back to creation at all! He begins with universes that are already "stellar." The old Book which he so much condemns is far away clearer and much more thoroughgoing. In its very first verse it says: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." It is no pleasure to have to be severe, but the boastful present-day astronomer is superficial compared with the Bible.

Much is made in this essay of the vastness of the universe. Because of its vast magnitude, the author thinks we must substitute some other god for the God of Christian theology as drawn from the Bible. But what kind of a god he wants instead, we are unable to decipher. However, the great physical bulk of the universe does not cancel or even modify the orthodox doctrine of God. Christian theology has always taught that God is infinite in His being and attributes. Therefore, no matter how great the universe is, the God of the Bible must be greater. When the Christian theologians teach that God is infinite (as they do and always have taught), they declare that He has no limits. Such a God could create any number of material universes He chose, and could sustain all of them, and keep every star speeding in its course, so as to prevent the cosmos from hurling itself into chaos. But note how our scientist travesties the Biblical doctrine of God. On account of the discovery of the great size of the universe, he says:

No longer could Deity be conceived as the immediate progenitor of mankind, the king of a favored tribe, the worker of magic, a sort of divine Santa Claus bestowing good gifts upon those most solicitous of his favors.

Is he a trustworthy teacher who is capable of thus distorting the Biblical doctrine of God? Who ever taught that God is "the immediate progenitor of mankind?" No one. The Bible teaches that God was the *Creator*, not the *progenitor*, of the first man, who was thereby constituted to be the genetic and generic head of the human race. The Bible condemns magic? The Bible teaches that God had a chosen people through whom to redeem the race; but it also teaches that He is the God of the universe and of all nations. What kind of a god is the one that Dr. Stetson be-

lieves in? Did he create the universe? Does he care for the sentient creatures he has brought into being? We fear he is merely a great big abstraction, and not a concrete personal being at all.

Then what is the substitute religion proposed by our astute astronomer? Here it is: By science "a new religion shall be evolved, based on reverence for the universe as is, rather than upon tradition which was."

But how can any one have reverence for the impersonal universe? No one can consistently worship a mere thing, a mere machine. The only rational conception is, that this wonderful universe in which we live leads us to reverence the personal and supreme God who has created it and who guides all its stars and planets in their orbits. A religion that is based on reverence for mere impersonal objects is a very nebulous kind of religion, if it is a religion at all worthy of the name.

A poor attempt is made in this essay to cheer us up a little in view of the fact that we are physically so small in comparison with the vast bulk and avoirdupois of the material universe. What is the author's idea? Well, man's body is made of the same kind of "stuff" as the stars. This suggests that he may also have kinship with "the spiritual world." What a vast amount of comfort and assurance there must be for a "scientist" in that little verb "may!" Then reflect on a sentence like the following for comfort and cheer in this vast, over-aweing universe:

Associated with the protoplasm of our bodily make-up is the ability to look into a starlit sky, and to conceive of an all but unending universe, a universe into which for a little while man comes to play his part, he knows not why, but how he plays; I fancy, will depend quite as much upon his religion as upon his science.

"Man comes to play his part, he knows not why!" What are we to think of that kind of a religion as a substitute for Christianity? When our scientist comes to deal with the problem of immortality, he is just as hazy and unsatisfactory. This is what he says—make out of it what you can:

However uncertain and illusory may be the evidence of spiritual existence apart from conventional forms of life as we know it, there appear to be sufficient grounds for a doctrine of immortality which the scientists would prefer to conceive of as a non-temporal persistence of personality rather than a re-existence in a future time scale.

Hazy as this doctrine is, futile as it is as a substitute for Christianity, it contains at least

two erroneous implications. If there is any definite meaning in the bombastic phrase, "a non-temporal persistence of personality," it is what the Bible and Christian theology have been teaching all along through the centuries, and is not therefore a new discovery by "the scientist." Christ Himself said, "He that believeth on the Son of God hath eternal life." That must be what is meant by the term "non-temporal." So the Bible has been centuries ahead of Dr. Stetson. The Bible also teaches the doctrine of the "persistence of personality." The personality of Lazarus and the penitent thief continued after the death of their bodies. Here again the Bible is centuries ahead of the scientist. But who holds such a doctrine as "re-existence in a future time scale?" No one. It is another man of straw. No Biblical Christian believes that the soul dies, or that personality perishes and then is caused to "re-exist." But the Biblical doctrines are clear and assured in a Christian experience; they are not like Stetson's anemic doctrine, "uncertain and illusory."

This critic of the Bible and the Christian Church also finds much fault with the churchly order of worship. "If one examines the conventional schedule of church worship, how far has it departed from the Mediæval trappings of ecclesiasticism?" he remarks. The words of church music do not make an "intellectual appeal." The hymnology is "based on the cosmology of Dante and the theology of the Mediæval Ages." It "can bring little intellectual satisfaction to the reader of scientific literature."

But mere criticism does little good. It is purely negative. We need something positive and constructive. And that is just what our astronomer fails to give us. If the present modes of Christian worship are so unsatisfactory, he ought to have put something better in their stead. Let him construct a clear and definite service that will express the right attitude toward the nebulous god his astronomy has "discovered." We should like wonderfully well to see such a "schedule of church worship". How would he express in worshipful forms his idea of "reverence for the universe?" Would he pray to the universe? If so, let him give a sample of such a prayer. And if he does not like the historic Apostles' Creed, let him compose a creed that scientific and intellectual people can recite with scientific and intellectual satisfaction.



Consistency is a jewel, said the wise dramatist; but we fear it does not sparkle in the crown of our astronomer. He makes great claims for science. It has made so many new discoveries that it is competent to destroy the Christian religion and give us a new and better one in its place. Indeed, our whole conception of God and the universe must be revised. And yet, strange to say, he admits (p.231) that "we are beginning to realize as never before that science has its limitations." For some purposes "the very tools of the physicist are too cumbersome." Science, after all, "can give but a one-sided look into the sum total of human experience." Hear this (p.232): "As to what was before

matter, scientists cannot answer, for the laws of science are based on weight and measurement of things."

But if science is under such a limiting handicap, how does it happen to be competent to revise all our religious beliefs and construct a substitute religion which will afford "intellectual satisfaction" to the scientists of our time? And, lastly, we raise the poignant question whether that modern talisman, "academic freedom," ought to go to such length in a church institution as to destroy the Christian faith for which it stands, without giving the world something definitely better as well as more uplifting in its stead.—L. S. K.

## The Flood and Geology

W. BELL DAWSON, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S.C., M. Inst. C.E.  
GOLD MEDALIST IN GEOLOGY, MCGILL UNIVERSITY

IT is important for those who believe the Bible to have correct ideas about the Flood, to enable them to show that the Scriptural account is reasonable history. Much light can also be thrown on the early history of mankind; for the Bible makes it clear that early human history is divided by the Flood into two great sections. A right understanding of what occurred at the Flood is very desirable therefore; especially in view of the important teaching which Christ Himself bases upon it in the Gospels, as well as the writers of the Epistles.

In an article in the February number of this periodical, based on a book entitled, *The Deluge Story in Stone*, a theory of the deluge in the days of Noah is put forward, which attempts to put the Flood in the place of the whole system of Geology as generally accepted. This theory has been named "Flood-geology," and by discrediting the usual Geology, it has made the opening chapters of Genesis very difficult of interpretation, in relation to natural science. In making this attempt, what Geology really believes and teaches is often misrepresented. Not only so, but those who will not discard the geological system as now understood and adopt a "New Geology," are classed by the author of this book as "men more or less lacking in religious convictions, . . . secretly or openly hostile to the Bible;" and actuated by "a dislike for those supernatural elements

which are the backbone of Christianity." What prevents them from accepting the Flood-geology, "is a disregard for God and the sacred character of His acts, and nothing else."

Such statements carry a grave reflection upon the integrity and Christian character of former geologists. The persons thus maligned would include Hugh Miller, Dean Buckland, Dana, Agassiz and Dawson, as well as many clergy and Christian leaders. The earlier geologists were quite aware of what had been attributed to the Flood, and considered it erroneous; yet for so doing, they cannot be classed with agnostics or unbelievers. Before Geology was understood, people supposed that any shells or other fossils found at a high level, must have been left there by the Flood. These crude ideas were fully discussed and shown to be a misunderstanding as soon as the rocks came to be reasonably investigated. It seems very strange therefore, that anyone in these days should bring up a theory of the Flood which would make it the cause of all the beds of rock in which fossils are found.

In combatting the misleading teachings of Evolution, it would be much more profitable to follow the results of recent research in its progress along the old lines, and to make the meaning of these known beyond the circle of the scientists. For it would thus become clear that the pillars erected by Darwin and

his successors to support the theory of Evolution, are now giving way one after the other. A series of these supports could be named, which evolutionists candidly admit to be no longer trustworthy. It is therefore quite unnecessary to undermine accepted Geology, and throw aside all that has been worked out, as though Geology necessarily supported Evolution; and a completely new start was required. To corroborate this, we need only point to Sir William Dawson, outstanding both as a geologist and a believer in Scripture, of whom *The International Encyclopædia* says: "He was known as one of the ablest opponents of the Darwinian theory."

Geology is a comparatively recent science, scarcely two centuries old; in contrast with astronomy which goes back to the earliest times. The broad foundations of Geology as laid by the pioneer geologists, several of them God-fearing men, have been generally accepted and built upon ever since. This gradual upbuilding is the more remarkable when contrasted with the complete revisions in some other sciences. Among the earlier pioneers, William Smith who brought out the epoch-making geological map of England in 1815, was the first to show how older and newer beds could be distinguished by their fossils; which was found so invaluable in the search for coal. Another pioneer was Hugh Miller, who published in 1850, *The Footsteps of the Creator*, to show that these are plain from the fossils in the rocks. In his work: *The Testimony of the Rocks*, (in 1857) he shows in four chapters the remarkable way that the account of the Creation in Genesis corresponds with the geological record, which he was even then able to perceive. He also discusses the Flood at length, in view of the Biblical narrative; and shows its true place in Geology.\* Those who wish to revive disproved ideas regarding the Flood, may be referred to his comprehensive review of these questions.

Now, all this serves to show that the geological system was not devised to support Evolution, nor to discredit the Bible. For Miller was a Christian believer, and his books were already published some years before Darwin's works on Evolution had appeared, in which Darwin tries to make use of Geology in support of his theories.

Another strange statement made by those who advocate the Flood-geology, is that geologists hold the "Onion-coat theory" of the formations. To take this literally would mean that the successive formations are spread in unbroken layers over every continent in the world. If this were the case, we would only know the top layer, and could not discover any geology at all, without boring into the earth to reach those below, except perhaps in some natural canyons. This is so contrary to the facts, that it cannot be taken seriously; and no one can be accused of holding such a view.

They also say that geologists believe in absolute uniformity, and that everything has gone on from the beginning exactly as it does now. According to Geology, there have been three great stretches of time since there was life in the world. They have Greek names to indicate this: Palæozoic, Mesozoic and Neozoic; and each of these includes several geological Ages or Formations, as described in any standard text-book. The first of these begins with sea creatures; the second is notably the age of the great reptiles; and in the third, there are the ordinary land animals and cattle, with man coming last on the stage. In a mere statement such as this, we can see the accord with the succession in the first chapter of Genesis; and when looked into more carefully, the divine origin of the account there given becomes very evident.

During each of these stretches of time, things went on quietly on the whole; but it is not fair on this account to say that all geologists are "uniformitarians." For it is recognized that there were severe breaks between these; when mountain ranges were formed, or great volcanic outbursts took place. Towards the close of the first stretch of time, there was a "great Interior Sea" in North America, and along its shore the Appalachian Mountains arose, and the great basin of that sea then became land. Taken altogether, "the geographical revolution which closed the Palæozoic era was accompanied by the most profound and far-reaching changes which have ever occurred in the recorded history of life; after which we find ourselves in a new world."

Again, the second great stretch of time (the Mesozoic) closed in an era of mountain making, extending on the line of the Rocky Mountains from the Arctic Ocean to Mexi-

\*The American edition was published in Boston by Gould and Lincoln, in 1857. Also in New York and Cincinnati.



co. "Vast volcanic outbreaks accompanied the upheaval, which was on a far grander scale than the Appalachian revolution had been." In Europe, the Mesozoic closed "by a gradual upheaval which excluded the sea from wide areas that it had occupied."\* Surely, the geologists cannot be called "animoforitarians."

Nor is there any reason in Geology for doubting the possibility of a Flood such as the Bible describes. For geologists are quite aware that great submergences of large parts of the continents have occurred during the geological ages. It should not therefore be said by those who support the theory of "Flood-geology," that geologists adhere so strictly to uniformity and the impossibility of a submergence, that they cannot believe in the Biblical Flood. On the contrary, to press upon them such a theory which they cannot possibly accept, and to maintain that it has the backing of the Scriptures, is only to alienate them from the Bible, which otherwise they might be very ready to support.

A further attempt is made to show that the succession of the geological ages cannot be trusted, because of "over-thrust." This has occurred in the upheaval of mountain ranges, when the rocks were crushed together, and some beds were broken and pushed over one another. An older bed may thus be found to be pushed bodily over a more recent formation; and such a fracture may extend for many miles along the edge of a range of mountains. But who can follow the reasoning by which this is taken to show that the whole sequence of the geological ages is unreliable?

When it comes to the relation of the Flood to the accepted Geology, there is very much that might be said. The question has been thoroughly investigated over the extent of Europe, by a competent and painstaking geologist, Dr. Joseph Prestwich. He found very definite indications of a great sweep of water, not in river valleys alone, but over the uplands. This carried much material along, as well as the bones of animals; and all the indications pointed to a sudden catastrophe.† The investigations of French geologists have confirmed this further.

It would thus appear that when the Flood

occurred, the waters of the ocean flowed in comparatively quietly over the land during the torrential rain; and it is noteworthy that the Ark drifted inland towards the mountains. But it was the tremendous wash of an ocean of water pouring off the continents when the land rose again, that carried so much debris with it, according to the geological evidence. How providential it was therefore that the Ark had already grounded on a mountain before this occurred, and so was saved from it.

As to the extent of the Flood, the Scriptures evidently maintain that it extended as far as man had then spread. For the only human beings saved were those in the Ark; and there was thus a new beginning for the human race. (See Genesis 7:21,23. Luke 17:27. 1 Peter 3:20 and 2 Peter 3:5,6). When we read therefore that "all the high hills . . . under the whole heaven were covered," it is not necessary to suppose that the whole land surface of the earth was under water at that time. We have very similar expressions elsewhere in Scripture; as when the Apostle Peter is said to have addressed men in Jerusalem "out of every nation under heaven;" yet this does not mean men from China and South America. (See also "all the world," in Luke 2:1). Many theological writers have so understood this; as for example the learned commentator Matthew Poole, who says: "It is not to be supposed that the entire globe of the earth was covered with water; for where was the need of overwhelming those regions in which there were no human beings?" This takes into account what we are told as to the purpose of God in causing the Flood to occur, when explaining the meaning of the description given.

A common method of discrediting the Bible is by thus exaggerating what it says so as to turn it into nonsense; and this theory of Flood-geology is a similar exaggeration which may have the same effect upon those who have made a study of physical conditions. To those acquainted with Geology as generally accepted, there is nothing incredible about a Flood of the extent indicated; for there were several submergences of very wide extent in different Ages, long before the human period. The really remarkable feature of the Flood to a geologist, is its very short duration; instead of continuing for an Age of some thousands of years, as others usually did. The historical Flood lasted for only a single year in the region of

\*From "An Introduction to Geology," by Professor W. B. Scott of Princeton University; pages 647, 648, 711 and 713.

†Article in *Trans. Victoria Institute*, London, 1894; Vol. 27, pages 263-284.

Mesopotamia, and it was not probably much longer elsewhere. We may see in this the purpose which God had in view regarding mankind, and in restoring the world promptly to habitability.

There is much of fascinating interest concerning the Flood, from many points of view; not to speak of the references to it which are made by Christ and the Apostles, and the important teaching based upon it which is often very solemn. But at present, we can only point out its physical aspects, in relation to the Scriptural account, which should be rightly understood. It affords also a conspicuous example of the way in which every statement in the Bible is a finger-post which points us in the right direction, in any line of scientific investigation we may undertake. For what is said regarding the Flood affords the right clue to many important matters. It explains for one thing, the widespread tradition found among all peoples

everywhere; and customs in commemoration of the dead at a special season of the year.

If this new beginning of the human race were accepted by Anthropologists, it would help them to account for very much which cannot otherwise be explained. There is more hope of this, since the recent discoveries made by Wooley and Langdon in Mesopotamia. Yet those who believed the Bible, had the true clues long ago to the interpretation of primitive men. For example, Sir William Dawson, after explaining the varied evidence for the Biblical Flood, makes the remark: "The deluge thus becomes one of the most important events, both in human history and in the study of the later geological periods, . . . so that any attempt to discuss the history of primitive man or his arts or his religion, without reference to this important factor, must necessarily be fallacious."

Montreal

## Quotations from Harry Rimmer

ELSEWHERE in this department appears a notice of Harry Rimmer's last book, *Modern Science and the Fifth Day of Creation*. Our readers will surely appreciate the following very pertinent quotations from that book. In speaking of spontaneous generation and the efforts often made to produce life in an artificial way, our author says:

"No human power has as yet accomplished this amazing work. The last attempt that was hailed by the press as a success was the attempt of a young Russian biologist, some years ago. He succeeded in producing—or, rather, organizing—five low forms of life in his test tube. The fact that they were of the lowest forms known did not militate against the wonders of the accomplishment, as that is just what we would expect to get from inorganic substances. He arranged his chemicals in a certain order in his test tube, subjected them to considerable heat, and eight hours later he had infusoria living in the tube.

"His announcement startled the world of biology, and as his formula was revealed, many other biologists tried to follow his experiments. But, alas, nobody but the discoverer seemed to be able to make it work. All that the others got was a mess of chem-

icals, no more alive than they had been when they reposed on the laboratory shelves. So they suggested that the discoverer repeat the experiments under observation, so that the rest could watch and see what mistakes they had made, if any.

"The young scientist suggested, instead, that they go through with the experiment while he watched them, and he could then correct any error they made. The last stage of the technique was to impregnate the mass with a gas ( $\text{CO}_2$ ) before it was subjected to heat. As the experimenters proceeded to do this, the inventor of the method said:

"'There is your trouble, gentlemen; you are using chemical dioxide. You must use gas that has been generated by rotting vegetation!'

"That, of course, pricked the bubble; the balloon collapsed. Gas generated by rotting vegetation is simply teeming with spores, or eggs, of a multitude of living creatures, so that all this chap had done was to incubate them in his test tube. He had no more created life than the farmer does when he puts eggs in his incubator to hatch out by artificial heat."

Thus we see that the last attempt to produce life from non-life was unsuccessful. It is like getting something out of nothing,



which seems to be unreasonable. Concerning those lowly and simpler forms of life known as the protozoa, Mr. Rimmer tells us some things which are very much to the point and very timely. Water, sap, juices, the oils and moisture of fruits, and many other things teem with these microscopical creatures. Let us quote:

"For the sake of convenience in nomenclature, the biologists call these tiny creatures 'animalcules.' But their species and varieties are legion. They are known by name, divided into orders and genera, dissected and classified, and there is an entire science of the protozoa. They differ as much one from another as cows and horses differ from one another, even when they are so small that a thousand of them can dwell in a single drop of water without crowding. They form an amazing field of research and of study.

"Since they are truly alive, they offer the same problems to the biologists that elephants or horses offer: where did they come from and how did they originate as living creatures? They never appear unless there have been progenitors, and they always reproduce each after its own kind. No matter how large or how small the creature may be in the world of biology, it never forgets this command of Moses for a single second."

Then Mr. Rimmer tells about the so-called "spores," which are really eggs, which live in the air, in the dust or on any kind of vegetation. When they are wet, they hatch out and produce myriads of living and moving animalcules. Our author adds:

"And when they hatch, they hatch out just exactly what their ancestors always were ever since they had ancestors. They never evolve, progress, or change into a higher order of protozoa; they remain what they were from the very beginning of time. The variety of their forms is an amazement to the careful student. Although there are myriads of varieties, they never seem to cross and confuse their original structure. . .

"Some of these creatures differ from others in form, and some differ from the rest in color or other characteristics; but there is no confusion in their classification. The order that is called Phizapod, for instance, may display as many as five hundred different body forms, but all announce the fact of specific creation by their obedience to the command of Genesis: 'each after its own kind.' Thus we are able to distinguish, classi-

fy, and keep in their regular order all the varieties of these creatures, and man can learn to know them each from the others by their appearance."

Very fascinating is Mr. Rimmer's description of the different methods of locomotion used by these animalcules. One kind moves itself by an encircling row of cilia; another has a single cilium in front and thus pulls itself along through the water; another has the cilium in the rear and so pushes itself forward; still others have no cilia, but move about by a queer method called ectoplasm. Their methods of feeding, digesting and reproducing are also exceedingly varied, but each species does these exploits after its own order. One does not merge or emerge into another. Having read this much of Mr. Rimmer's pamphlet, you will want to get it and read it all.—L. S. K.

## He Leadeth Me

DR. EDWARD D. MALLORY

What a world of beauty, brightness, and blessing is wrapped up in those three words:  
He leadeth me.

How happy, exceedingly happy, yes inexpressibly happy, must every one be who can say and feel the truth the bright and glorious truth of these words:

He leadeth me.

He Who is the brightness of the Father's glory:

He leadeth me.

He in Whom are hid all the reasons of wisdom and knowledge!

He leadeth me.

He Who has all power (sovereignty) in heaven and in earth!

He leadeth me.

He Who loves me even as the Father loves Him!

He leadeth me.

He Who declared, "Lo I am with you always!"

He leadeth me.

Glory, glory, hallelujah!

He leadeth me.

Boston

"God does not expect you to live His Life, without first giving you His Nature."—*Adapted.*

## Reviews of Recent Books

**The Trial of Denominationalism.** By Rev. Nicholas J. Monsma. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. \$1.25.

A couple of months ago we had barely time to notice and commend this book, but promised to give it further attention. The general position which the author takes seems to us to be sensible. He recognizes the evils that result from the divisions of the Lord's people into various groups. For one thing, it is a puzzle to the outside world to see people who believe the same Book, the Bible, thus divided among themselves. Again, there often—far too often, indeed—arise quarrels and jealousies among the different denominations, who treat one another as rivals instead of cooperators in the extension of Christ's kingdom. However, our author does not believe that the merging of all Christian people into one vast organization would solve the church's problems and remove all sins of commission and omission. Such a great ecclesiastical body would be likely to reach out for secular and political power, just as was the case when there was practically but one great big church in central and western Europe during the Middle Ages. After treating of the problems of denominationalism, our author gives an illuminating chapter to "Denominationalism *Versus* Roman Catholicism," and shows how impossible it would be to unite these two divisions of Christendom. The chapter on "Denominationalism *Versus* Liberalism" ought to be read by everybody, whether evangelical or modernistic. The author also discusses the possibilities of inter-denominationalism. A treatment of the goal of denominationalism forms the last part of his argument. He believes that the various evangelical denominations should not wrangle and compete, but should work side by side for kingdom-advancement. Evangelical people of the various branches should get together in conferences to strengthen one another in the faith, increase the bonds of fellowship, and join hands in opposing the forces of heresy and iniquity.

**By the Light of the Cross.** By Winfield Burggraaff, Th.D. Wm. B. Eerdmans Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. 35 cents.

We wish that we could have had these helpful "Meditations for Lent" a couple of months ago, so that we could have called

attention to them at the beginning of the Lenten season. Now that this holy season is over, we will suggest the next best thing. Get the booklet, anyway, because it can be read at any time for spiritual edification and uplift. A suitable text and a suggestive meditation for every day in Lent are given. Then, even if the book is read now, it can still be kept for next year's Lenten season, because these meditations are of permanent value. The author tells us what is the real purpose of Lent: "The season of Lent is for the believer a time for special calling to mind of the suffering and death of our Lord." Note the prices. The publishers say: "We have arranged the prices in this manner because we believe the book to be ideal for gifts—for churches to give to their catechism classes and members and for ministers and Christian laymen to give to their friends."

**Son of Thunder.** By J. P. D. Llwyd. Ray Long & Richard R. Smith, Inc., 12 East 41 Street, New York City. \$1.50.

Confession must be made that this is a difficult book for an evangelical reviewer to analyze and appraise. Dr. Llwyd is Dean of Nova Scotia and Rector of All Saints' Cathedral, Halifax. He was born in England, with a background mainly Welsh, as his name indicates. His book is beautifully written; it might almost be called a prose poem. It is, according to the sub-title, a study of the life and work of John of Bethsaida, fisher of men. That is, it aims to present a life of John the apostle. Many lives of Christ and Paul have appeared, says the author, but no adequate life of John. In this book the author has tried to make a start in presenting a true and full estimate of this apostle, his work and his influence on the ages. However, it must be said that the author, instead of staying by the data given in the New Testament and in history regarding John, and thus giving a realistic picture, has overlaid the facts with many imaginary details. Perhaps there is no harm in doing this, and yet, when the imaginary parts are told as if they were true and often treated in as factual a way as are the known facts, we wonder whether the effect on the reader will be wholesome; whether such an imaginary treatment will not create an unfavorable reaction. What facts we know about the life of St. John can be put in a few pages at the



very most. Of course, if an analysis of his writings, as given in the New Testament, were attempted, a large volume could be produced; but that has often been done in the past. The author has liberalistic tendencies. Note the following: "The resurrection narratives are confused and even contradictory" (p.73). He blurs the fact of the bodily resurrection of Christ, and says, "The great central fact on which all the writers agree is that Christ was alive" (p.74). How any one could be sure that He was alive if He did not rise from the dead is not explained by the author. He calls the raising of Lazarus from the dead and the appearances of Jesus after the first Easter day "noble myths" (p.76). "Just what we are to think of the story of the descent of the Spirit on the first Whitsunday may not be clear" (p.78). What is not clear to our mind is how a Christian scholar can accept parts of the New Testament narratives and reject the rest. It is possible, however, that the fertile imagination of the writer explains that problem.

**Bible Verses to Memorize.** Selected by Helen M. G. Shepard. American Tract Society, 7 West 45 Street, New York City. 50 cents.

In this dainty booklet Mrs. Shepard has gathered together under various headings a large number of the most precious and relevant passages of the Bible to be committed to memory. She herself bears witness to the value, in the way of comfort and inspiration, the memorizing of such Biblical selections in her childhood have been to her throughout her varied and useful life. The book should be bought by parents and kept in the home, and the children should be encouraged—perhaps even required—to commit a few verses every day. Such verses, lodged in their minds, would be the best guard they could have against sin in subsequent life. "Thy Word have I hid in my heart that I might not sin against thee."

**A Lamp unto my Feet.** By Rev. John R. Gunn. Ray Long & Richard R. Smith, Inc., New York City. \$1.50.

"If these talks bring light and comfort to any, it will be because they come from that Book which has been to me through the years—'A lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path.'" When an author says that in his preface, it begets confidence that he not only knows the Bible, but has also had an experience of its divinely inspired and inspiring character. And that is just what we

find in this engaging book. It is made up of brief talks on many salient passages of Scripture. In the author's hands the Bible becomes a radiant book, with "wonderful words of life" which fit into every human condition and experience. As we read, we cannot help feeling how relevant to human need are the teachings of the Bible. In your joy it rinses and enhances your felicity; in your sorrow, no matter what it is, it comforts and upholds you with its uplifting messages. Mr. Gunn's book, which is loyal throughout to Christ and the Bible, might well be used as a daily handbook of devotion. Mr. Gunn is well known as the author of two books of "Three-Minute Sermons."

**The Fact of a Future Life.** By Courtland Myers, D.D., LL.D. Ray Long & Richard R. Smith, Inc., New York City.

How stimulating is a clarion voice! Here are tones that give no uncertain sound. Dr. Myers does not deal in vague guesses about God and man and the future life. When men can lift their thought from the realm of mere materialistic science and its misty guesses about ultimate realities to the higher reaches of reason and worth-while aspiration, they must conclude that "death does not end all." Our author's reasoning is sound. He presents three lines of argument. From "the fact of man" he concludes that he must be immortal. He reaches the same conclusion from "the fact of God." In his last chapter he reaches the climax by appealing to "the fact of Christ." Many of the author's sayings are worth treasuring:

I am not dependent upon the house in which I now live. When I have paid my last rent, I will move out into a better one. . . . If there is a personal God of reason and justice and love at the center of this universe, then the interrogation-point after the fact of a future life is forever rubbed out. . . . He (Christ) says, "Because I live ye shall live also,"

and no interrogation-mark follows it.

In Dr. Myers' inspiring book you do not find long-drawn-out and abstruse argument, but the strong and convincing reasoning of common sense. The many quotations regarding the future life from the writings of great men and women add much to the testimony of the book.

**"He Whom a Dream Hath Possessed."** By Rev. John Knox. Ray Long & Richard R. Smith Inc., New York City. \$1.50.

What shall be said of this unique book? It is mystical (and a little misty in places), poetical, imaginative, epigrammatic, and here

and there somewhat heretical. Mr. Knox is the minister of Fisk University, and affectionately dedicates his book to the faculty and students of that institution. He has taken the name of a poem by Shaemas O'Sheel as the title of his book, which, we must confess, is a somewhat blind title. A line in this strange poem forms the motto for each chapter. Sometimes one has difficulty in seeing the connection between the chapter and its heading. Sometimes Mr. Knox writes like an evangelical; then he says something that puts him into modernist company. It is strange to us that one who is so spiritual can be so indifferent to theology and doctrine. That is why he is not always consistent in his thinking. He speaks of some passages of Scripture as if he did not believe them; soon after he quotes a passage as if it were eternal truth. He believes that faith is something that must be attained by struggle, whereas Paul says "it is the gift of God." He holds that it was easier to believe in Christianity when people thought the universe was small and the earth its center. We cannot see why. Christianity has always taught that God is infinite in essence, power and wisdom; therefore He could just as easily create a vast universe as a small one. We must agree with him, however, when he avers that it is easier to believe that God created man in His own image than that He evolved him by a long and bloody struggle from the amoeba through millions of years; but we cannot agree that this evolutionary theory "makes possible a vastly more splendid faith in God." He is right when he says that "laxness is not freedom," but when further on he identifies determinism with freedom, he becomes prolix and obscure. Here and there he discredits theologies and creeds, which explains why one cannot tell just what he believes as to doctrine. When he says, "But Jesus the man is far greater than Jesus the god" (small "g"), we are both startled and shocked. He thinks that "faith has little to do with dogma and creed of the historic kind." But with what kind of "dogma" and "creed" has it something to do? Of faith he says, "its associations are rather with choices, decisions, life commitments." If that has any definite meaning, it is precisely what the historic dogmas and creeds teach. As to the events connected with the nativity of Christ, he thinks "it does not matter whether they happened or not." Surely evangelical believers cannot under-

write such statements as these: "The human and the divine become identical; the Word and the flesh became one. The old distinction between the natural and supernatural is done away—the whole world is one," etc. That leans toward pantheism. It is a pity that so many good and true things as are found in this book should be set in a modernistic context.

**The Climax of Revelation.** By Rev. Julian Scales Sibley, D.D. Fleming H. Revell Co., 158 Fifth Ave., New York. \$1.50.

Very different is this book. From the very start you know just what Dr. Sibley believes. He uses no poetical and misty phrases which obscure his real convictions. He stands solidly on the doctrine of the inspiration of the Bible in its entirety, and does not believe in tearing it to pieces by a critical process. However, he does not leave this conviction to mere assertion, but gives many good reasons for his stalwart evangelical faith in the Canonical Scriptures. By his title he means that the whole Bible is a special divine revelation which finds its "climax" in Jesus Christ, who is the true and final revelation of God and His purpose of redemption. Dr. Sibley is the minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Shelbyville, Tenn. He certainly gives his congregation solid and nutritious food. His initial chapter, "The Need of a Revelation," goes to the root of the matter. He shows how far short of meeting the needs of the human soul the speculations of human wisdom fall. While he is a friend of science, he realizes that science cannot tell us about Christ and pardon and salvation. He stands firmly for both the true deity and humanity of Christ, thus giving the whole doctrine of Christ. He upholds the virgin birth of Christ, showing that it was a metaphysical necessity to give the world a divine-human Saviour. "The Divine Sonship" and "The Ideal Man Realized" are two well-correlated chapters. Indeed, Dr. Sibley's book as a whole and in all its parts is most refreshing in these days of deadly doubt and misty religion.

**Cyclopedia of Evangelism.** By Charles L. Goodell, D.D. Ray Long & Richard R. Smith, Inc., 12 East 41 Street, New York. \$1.00.

This enterprising firm has now published three volumes by Dr. Goodell on evangelism in one neat and convenient book, and have priced it at only \$1.00. It is one of their dollar "Anvil Series of Religious Books."



As we all know, Dr. Goodell, although connected with the Federal Council of Churches, is very much in earnest about the conversion of souls. He has a real passion for winning people to Christ—using the word "passion" in the best sense and not in the sense of emotionalism and sentimentalism. While he disclaims these extremes, he believes that there is a powerful emotional element in the Christian religion, though it should not be overstressed. Perhaps our author is too sanguine regarding theological pacifism and agreement in the church; for he says in his preface to his first volume:

Even higher criticism itself has spent much of its force; some of its contentions have been established and others have been proven to be of too little value longer to disturb and irritate the church. The great fundamentals of the Christian life have never been more generally accepted inside the church than they are today.

We fear these statements are not up to date, for many books are being issued today both in this country and Great Britain that follow the liberalistic cult and take the conclusions of the liberal critics for granted. On this, however, we agree with Dr. Goodell—that many people today are utterly indifferent to religious and spiritual verities, and need to be awakened, convicted and converted. That is the great task today of evangelism. We believe that the liberalism of our day has done much to bring about this deadly apathy toward religion. When a church ceases to be evangelical, it will cease to be evangelistic. This book ought to do much toward arousing conviction in people both inside and outside of the Christian church.

**Communion With God: Prayers for Chapel, Pastoral and Private Use.** Compiled by Rev. Elmore McNeil McKee. Ray Long & Richard R. Smith, Inc., New York, N. Y. \$1.75.

As the sub-title indicates, this is a collection of prayers. The author was formerly chaplain of Yale University, and conducted the devotional services in that institution in a most inspiring and effective way—a way that brought the worshippers into real communion with God. It does not exactly set well with evangelical folk that Dr. Ernest Fremont Tittle was selected to write the foreword to the volume, because he is known to be quite liberalistic, as his book, *The Religion of the Spirit*, gives direct proof. However, the prayers themselves have everywhere the evangelical basis and spirit. If such prayers are used sincerely, they can

come only from hearts which have experienced the truth as it is in Christ and in the Word of God. The great majority of the prayers are invoked in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, or for His sake, or through Him. In one selection from the *Book of Common Prayer*, we read: "through Him who is the Eternal Truth, the Son, our Master, Jesus Christ." Another prayer, one by the author himself, ends with "our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ." While Christ is frankly acknowledged, we miss those great prayers of the Christian Church which close with ascriptions of praise to the Holy Trinity—"the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, world without end." All the prayers, whether original with the author or selected from other sources, are of a dignified and truly devotional character. They are suitable for almost all thinkable occasions.

**The Secret of the Universe.** By Nathan R. Wood. Fleming H. Revell Co., 158 Fifth Ave., New York City. \$2.00.

If you want to follow the reasoning of a real "argufyer," just get this book and read it. Whether you will like the book or not depends on whether you want to do some tall thinking and probe into the depth of realities, or whether you prefer simply to accept the fact of the universe in a simple and naive way. Dr. Wood (if he is not a doctor, he ought to be) is the president of the Gordon College of Theology and Missions, Boston, Mass., an institution which is known to be loyal to Christ and the Bible. With all his profound speculations and reasonings, the author is thoroughly evangelical. The core of his argumentation is this: God is a Trinity—a Triunity; He is Father, Son and Holy Spirit, three Persons in one Godhead. When we come to look deeply into the universe, we find that it bears the stamp of both oneness and threeness. Space is one, yet has three dimensions; matter is one, yet manifests itself in energy, motion and phenomenon; time is one, yet is known as past, present and future. Our author points out a marvellous parallelism between these triunities and the divine Triunity. But of course the comparison does not hold in every respect, because space, matter and time are not persons; they are not self-conscious egos. Then the human mind reflects something of the divine threefoldness in that it functions in intellect, emotion and will. The process of self-consciousness is also threefold, in



what some one has called the subjective ego, the objective ego and the percipient ego; yet there is only one ego. The author here rightly recognizes both the similarity and the dissimilarity between the human mind and the triune God; that is, man has only one center of self-consciousness, while God has three such centers. So man is only one person; God is three. When, however, our author finds an exact replica between God and man in man's nature, person and personality, we cannot follow him; for we cannot see that the nature is one person, the person another, and the personality another. Of course, there are both oneness and threeness here, but it is not like the oneness and threeness of the Godhead. Neither do we grasp clearly the author's speculations about matter, for we can find nowhere that he treats matter as a real entity, which we believe it to be; a real "thing in itself;" or, as the Germans put it, *das Ding an sich*. We think that matter has the attributes of energy, motion and phenomenon, but the attributes are not the thing itself. Our author fails to distinguish sharply enough between *noumenon* and *phenomenon*. We feel somewhat blind, too, about the view that motion produces time. Even if the universe were perfectly static, would not time still go on? Well, these criticisms are minor matters. The great value of Dr. Wood's profound book is this: it shows clearly that the only adequate and reasonable explanation of the universe is the Triune God of the Bible as its Creator, Preserver and Redeemer. There is a good deal of repetition in the book; but the author's evident purpose is to keep his main proposition constantly before the reader's mind. The book is a most valuable apologetic for true Trinitarian Christianity. The unity of the Godhead—that is, monotheism—is duly emphasized, while His tri-personality is adequately set forth.

**The Sunday School in Action.** By Clarence H. Benson. The Bible Institute Colportage Association, 843-845 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill. \$1.75.

The well-known author of this valuable treatise is the director of the Christian Education Course in the Moody Bible Institute. He is the author of a number of books of importance, especially in the treatment of children and young people and their Christian culture and salvation. The present book aims to correct some of the faults of present methods of instruction and administration, to set forth better methods, and, above all,

to emphasize the supreme importance of giving the rising generation the proper kind and amount of Christian instruction. He believes that our civilization and our country's welfare, as well as the salvation of individuals, depend on the thorough religious training of the young. The main thing in the Sunday school is, of course, the spiritual well-being of the members, but to accomplish this primary object there must be proper organization, effective administration, adequate housing, the right kind of training for the teachers, and many other details. This book has great value along every line of Sunday school activity. Each chapter is supplemented with a list of questions. In the way of method and arrangement of material, it will prove an effective textbook for Sunday school workers. We hope it will be largely used for that purpose. It is an interesting and important book for every member of the Sunday school, and ought to be studied especially by the officers and teachers of the school. Indeed, it is a book that cannot be praised too highly.

**The Basis of Evolutionary Faith.** By Floyd E. Hamilton, Th.M. James Clarke & Co., 9 Essex Street, Strand, London, W.C.2, England. 6 shillings.

This book has arrived too late for a complete review in this issue. Attention is called to it now on account of its great value. It is one of the most scholarly and thoroughgoing critiques of the theory of evolution that has been published. We hope it will have a large circulation in this country, and that it will open the eyes of many people to the scientific weakness of evolution and its injurious effects on the Christian faith of many people. It may be obtained in this country from *Christianity Today*, 501 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. Price \$1.50. Our readers will remember Mr. Hamilton as the author of *The Basis of the Christian Faith*, which is also a book of much value and ability.

**The Holy Scriptures According to the Masoretic Text.** A New Translation with the aid of previous versions and with constant consultation of Jewish authorities. The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, Pa. Pp., 1,136. Cloth, \$1.25.

The Christian world has been slow to discover this new Jewish translation of the Old Testament. The sixth impression was issued in 1925, which indicates that the Jews have not been slow to appreciate it. Having known



the chairman of the Editorial Board for some forty odd years, it at once appeared desirable to me to have a copy of this translation to supplement the other four in constant use in my work. The result was wholly unexpected. The Jewish translation proved to be so satisfactory that the other four have become mere works of reference, occupying the place assigned to the Jewish one.

It differs from the Authorized Version just enough to correct errors, simplify statements by eliminating needless glosses, and modernize ancient linguistic forms. This last feature will not appeal to Christian readers who have become attached to archaic sware, etc., used in our Bibles. This version always uses *swore*, and it is a bit hard to get used to it. In spite of that fact, the general effect is so marked that, once accustomed to its peculiarities, the user will be likely to prefer it to all other translations.

As would be expected, it employs the Hebrew order of arrangement of the different books. It begins with *The Law*, or *Pentateuch*. *The Prophets* come next, including the major and minor prophets except Daniel, and Joshua, Judges, I and II Samuel, and I and II Kings. The order of the English books is kept in the grouping. Lastly come *The Writings*, beginning with Psalms and ending with II Chronicles. Daniel is placed between Esther and Ezra. Job is third and Ruth fifth in the list. This arrangement soon loses its oddity, and no difficulty is encountered in finding any desired book.

The diction is especially good. It brings out with vividness the picture it presents, and the different types of writing are so printed that the reader can grasp instantly the fact that a different style of composition is involved. If ministers and others once become acquainted with this version, it is likely to prove so attractive that other new translations will have a hard time to gain a foothold, and the old ones will lose much of their power. In fact, this translation appears to have done exactly what the first revision was intended to do, but failed to accomplish—correct the Authorized Version and make it satisfactory. While it might have gone further in some things, such as the recognition of patronymics as such, its work is so good on the whole that improvements are not easy to frame even where they may seem to be in order.—H. W. M.

## Additional Literary Notes

It is always a pleasure to receive publications from Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd., Paternoster Buildings, London. We do not know that they have put their imprint on any book that is unsound in its theology. They evidently censor manuscripts very carefully. Thus they will never need to give an account for having led any one away from faith in Christ. They have sent us two valuable tracts by our well-known friend, Dr. W. Bell Dawson, of Montreal, Canada, who has a number of scientific titles to his name and who is Gold Medalist in Geology in McGill University.

Both of these booklets bear the title, *Is Evolution True?* One of them shows "how the Creator planned for His creatures." By following the Biblical account of creation step by step, he proves how reasonable it is that God would make such a world as ours. The antecedent steps were always definitely a preparation for what was to follow. For example, the making of light, the forming of the atmosphere (Hebrew, *expanse*), the dividing of the land and the water—all these were necessary steps in the process before life of any kind could be introduced into the world. Vegetation had to come before animal life. There was such evident teleology in the method as to connote an intelligent personal Creator as the only adequate explanation and the only reasonable inference. At the same time the author shows how inadequate is the theory of evolution to explain the varied phenomena of the universe. Thinking men ought to accept the most reasonable view—the view that really explains things and that agrees with the observed facts.

The second booklet points out "what the stars, plants and atoms tell us." Here the author shows that the theory of evolution cannot give an adequate account of the origin and purpose of the stars and plants, nor of the original combination of atoms into molecules, nor of the beginning of life. He shows that it would be impossible for plant life to develop into animal life, because the chemical and physical processes are so utterly different in the two kinds of life.

Whatever Dr. George E. Guille wrote was of a spiritual character, because he stuck close to the Bible. At the time of his lamented death he was president of William Jennings Bryan University at Dayton, Tenn.



The Bible Institute Colportage Association, 843-845 North Wells Street, Chicago, has just issued a book by Dr. Guille which bears the title, *The Gospel of the Crucifixion*. In a tender and pathetic way the author takes up the narrative of our Lord's crucifixion and comments on each paragraph and shows its significance in the plan of salvation and in the unfolding life of the Christian. Since Christ on the cross took upon Himself the penalty of our transgressions, there is a real gospel in the crucifixion. Price, 15 cents.

Anent a previously published article in this department, a correspondent writes us that Dr. Albert T. Clay's book, *The Origin of Biblical Traditions*, "would have given additional arguments for the article, 'The Great Deluge and the Gilgamesh Epic,' in the February number of CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE. Dr. Clay gave proof—unanswered to date—that the Deluge story could not have been of Babylonian origin. . . . Please call attention to the above book, and keep up the prevailing interest in the Noachian Deluge. Keep the irons in the fire."

Thanks to our correspondent. When Dr. Clay's work was published in 1923 we read it and commented on its contents, but we do not have it by us just at this writing. In our book, *A System of Christian Evidence* (p. 165) we say in a footnote: "Dr. Clay shows clearly that the narratives and laws of the Pentateuch could not have been derived from the Babylonian myths as their source." Dr. Clay's excellent book is published by Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn. The price is \$3.00.

If you want to read a booklet of hammer blows, get Dr. I. M. Haldeman's *Who is the Rock: Peter or Christ?* Dr. Haldeman never "beats about the bush." No; he attacks it directly and reduces it to fragments. By an examination of Scripture and history he proves that Christ meant Himself, not Peter, when He said, "On this rock I will build my church." The price of the booklet is 10 cents. Address Francis Emory Fitch, Inc., 138 Pearl Street, New York City.

It is a pleasure to call attention to a new Rimmer booklet. This time the title is, *Modern Science and the Fifth Day of Creation*. In this brochure Mr. Rimmer has done fine work. By many tokens he shows that the Biblical account of the first appearance of

animals on the fifth creative day corresponds with the findings of modern science. This is one of the spiciest, as well as one of the most convincing, books that Harry Rimmer has issued, and they are all good. He exposes the impossibility of spontaneous generation, and shows that even the many species of the protozoa always reproduce each "after its kind," just as is taught of organisms in the Mosaic record in Genesis. If you want to see for yourself how cogent Mr. Rimmer makes his arguments just send for the book, addressing Research Science Bureau, Inc., 5141 Crenshaw Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif. Price, 25 cents.

Number 44 of "The Evangel Booklets" has now been added to this useful series by the Bible Institute Colportage Association, 843-845 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill. The title is, *The Scientific Mind and Christianity*, and the author Professor M. H. Duncan, who is so well known as a staunch and able upholder of the evangelical position. Throughout his book he insists on applying the truly scientific tests to Christianity that the physicist uses in his laboratory. He holds that many of the scientists employ the scientific method in their own sphere, but forsake it the moment they begin to deal with moral and spiritual data. For our part, we think that many scientists fail to use the strictly scientific method even in their own department of knowledge, and hence indulge in many wild and fabulous speculations. The scientists themselves, as well as everybody else, ought to read Professor Duncan's closely reasoned booklet. 10 cents per copy, \$1.00 per dozen.

In the February number of this magazine (p.112) we asked whether any of our readers could refer us to an adequate answer to Harry Elmer Barnes' very radical infidel book, *The Twilight of Christianity*. We have had no specific answer to that request. However, our alert New York mentor has referred us to two articles which expose the vulnerability of Professor Barnes' general position. They are found in prior numbers of this magazine and its predecessor. See the *Bible Champion* for April, 1929, pp.170-172, and CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE for October, 1931, pp.512-514. Our friend also gives us some other data of which we may make use later.